

# BACONIANA

VOL. XXXIX (70th Year)

No. 152

SEPTEMBER, 1955

*It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors, or correspondents.*

## EDITORIAL

THROUGH the kindness of Mr. Wilfrid Woodward, who has recently become a member of our Council, we have before us an unpublished manuscript by his father the late Parker Woodward, who wrote so many interesting articles for our journal during the first quarter of this century. Readers will remember that, broadly speaking, Parker Woodward concentrated on Elizabethan literature and its problems, while his brother Frank specialized in the cypher counts and acrostic signatures to be found therein. What we have before us now is really more than a manuscript, for it is the printers' proof of a book which was not published. The Title Page is inscribed as follows:

SIR FRANCIS BACON

Poet - Philosopher - Statesman -

Lawyer - Wit

Essay

by

Parker Woodward

"Towards a more complete Biography"

In this interesting essay, which comprises an author's Preface and twenty-nine chapters of two or three pages apiece, Mr. Woodward attempts to relate the main features of Lord Bacon's recorded life with:

- (a) The registration and publication of the Shakespeare Plays and other contemporary literature:
- (b) The cypher story relating to Bacon's parentage.

With the skill and felicity of a lawyer accustomed to marshalling evidence, Mr. Woodward co-ordinated the known facts of Bacon's life with the registrations at Stationers' Hall, and the printing of many works which conveniently remained anonymous until the individuals upon whom they were fathered were dead and buried.

Why then, did Mr. Woodward withhold this essay from the Press? Although no one, not even Mr. Wilfrid Woodward, can speak with finality on this question, it seems that he thought it was premature, unwise, and possibly tactless, to interweave so much of the cypher story (on which opinion was so divided) with a literary theory which rested on much concrete evidence, and which was already so well documented. We sought Mr. Wilfrid Woodward's permission to print extracts from this unpublished work which, with a little editing, would not appear to be unduly dogmatic. One day it may be possible to go further, but for the present Mr. Woodward has consented to the printing of such passages as he feels his father would have passed. Naturally some of these cover ground which the author had previously covered in contributions to *BACONIANA*, and in his book *Tudor Problems*; but this essay is expressed somewhat differently and, instead of a repetition of earlier work, readers will have the final flowering of a mind which had made the study of Lord Bacon's work a labour of love for more than half a lifetime.

\* \* \* \*

The articles on Delia Bacon, under the title of "A Pioneer" will be resumed in the next issue; these having been held in abeyance while other subjects are introduced. Meanwhile we understand that a new biography of Delia Bacon is due to be published in America by Vivian C. Hopkins. We shall welcome any new light on the career of this brave New Englander who came over to England and entered the arena, single-handed (so far as she knew) against the experts of her time.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Calvin Hoffman of America is "news" again. The Marlovian theory—that Marlowe's "death" was faked, and that the Shakespeare MSS were written later by him—is considered by the Press to be of greater news value than the long-established Baconian heresy. Certainly Mr. Hoffman commands our respect by the pertinacity and enthusiasm which he shows in demonstrating his beliefs. "Frizer" or "Frezer" who recently featured in our correspondence columns, is still thought, apparently, to be a conspirator in this Elizabethan "who-dun-it." However, no documents have yet been revealed in Douai Abbey recording Marlowe's or Ingram Frezer's supposed visits, nor has Mr. Hoffman's statement that the Droeshout portrait can be identified as a depiction of Marlowe, yet been proved.

We await the outcome of Mr. Hoffman's renewed attempts to open Francis Walsingham's tomb in Scadbury Chapel, Christchurch, Kent, and also the publication of his promised book, with interest.

\* \* \* \*

We have had occasion before to comment favourably on Mr. Eric Webb's wholehearted work on behalf of the Society in the North. We are, therefore, pleased to reproduce another Press reference to his activities, which appeared in *The Journal*, on Friday, February 25th last. More power to your elbow, Mr. Webb!



## LITERARY SOCIETY - LEIGH

An exposition of one of the most intriguing controversies in English Literature was given by Mr. Eric Webb, a member of the Baconian Society, at a meeting of Leigh Literary Society, on Monday.

He put forward the view that the author of Shakespeare's plays was not indeed Shakespeare, the uneducated money-lender from Stratford, but Francis Bacon, who was undoubtedly the greatest genius of the epoch.

Mr. Webb pointed out that a man of Shakespeare's scanty education and experience could not have such a good knowledge of the classics, nor of foreign countries in which many of the plays take place—countries which he had never visited. Bacon, on the other hand, was well educated, and had been abroad many times. Some of the language in the plays was the University jargon of the times, and Bacon was a University scholar. Most of the notable diarists of the time mentioned Bacon and other notable writers, but the name of Shakespeare, the greatest of them all, was to be found nowhere.

A very important discovery was the Northumberland Manuscript on which Bacon had written many quotations and titles of Shakespeare's plays. The best lines of "Othello" he said, were written after Shakespeare's death.

As his final and most interesting point, Mr. Webb explained how acrostics, of which Bacon was very fond, appear frequently in the works of Shakespeare. In one speech from "Love's Labour Lost," Mr. Webb showed how the name of Francis Bacon and the words "Hang Hog"—which appear in a Bacon family joke—were concealed. The acrostics were so wonderfully involved that, if indeed Bacon did write the plays, we should be compelled to admire him as much for his mathematics as for his literature. . . .

We understand that Mr. Webb inspired a barrage of questions on points arising out of his lecture, which *The Journal* tells us, "furnished much food for thought."

\* \* \* \*

Roderick Eagle is a name which is well known to students of "Shakespeare's" life and works, and this is especially true of Beckenham, Kent, where he was at one time responsible for open-air productions of the Plays. The *Beckenham Journal* last April referring to his newly published brochure, *Bacon or Shakespeare: A Guide to the Problem*, remarks that this "serves admirably as a succinct introduction to the theory that the works of Shakespeare were written by Francis Bacon. Mr. Eagle is the author of more extensive works on the subject but the present little booklet is sufficient to whet the appetite of newcomers to the matter, and to invite them to explore further the fascinatingly ingenious deductions of the experts." We still have an ample stock of these booklets. Members are reminded that they serve as excellent propaganda for their uninitiated friends!

\* \* \* \*

In the May BACONIANA we commented upon the correspondence on *The Vocabulary of the Biliteral Cipher*. We print below two inter-

esting letters on the subject which seem to dispose of the idea that the word *cressive* was unknown in Bacon's era.

In the current issue of *BACONIANA* just received, and full of interest as usual, Mr. Eagle asks in regard to the word "cressive" used by Mrs. Gallup:

"How could Bacon have used a word unknown in England, and not even included in any English dictionary?"

Bacon evidently knew the word as on the second page numbered 70 of the Histories in the 1623 Folio (the second page of *Henry V*) we find that the Prince's Contemplation

"Grew like the Summer Grasse, fastest by Night,  
Unseen yet *cressive* in his facultie."

Yours faithfully,

F. V. MATARALY

Since my article in *BACONIANA*, August 1953, where I questioned the word "cressive" in Mrs. Gallup's cipher vocabulary, I have been able to trace its source. The word appears as a misprint in the First Folio version of *Henry V* for "crescive." All editors have agreed that there never was such a word as "cressive," and that the lines spoken by the Bishop of Ely should read:

Grew like the summer grass, fastest by night,  
Unseen, yet *crescive* in his faculty.

"Crescive" is derived from *cresco*. The word was not coined by Shakespeare, for it is found in Drant's *Horace: Art of Poetry* (1567):

"As lusty youths of *crescive* age doe flourishe freshe and grow."

Shakespeare uses "crescent" in the sense of growing or increasing in *Hamlet*, I, 30 *Cymbeline* I, 4 and *Anthony and Cleopatra* II, I.

The Folio misprint is obviously due to the compositor misunderstanding a reader who called out the word. The former, not being familiar with such an unusual word set the type as it sounded to him. There are other errors due to dictation in the text of *Henry V*. Two of them occur in French dialogue proving that the compositor did not know French. Thus, "*à cette heure*" is printed "asture," and "*il est appelé*" appears as "*il & appelé*." He confused "est" with "et."

But how is the repetition of a Folio error in Mrs. Gallup's "decipherment" to be explained?

Yours faithfully,

R. L. Eagle

\* \* \* \*

We have commented before on the B.B.C. West Region feature called "Air Space." It is gratifying to know that the Stratford "birthplace" and "birthday" have both been publicly challenged by members of the Society, who write as follows:

In August 1948 Mr. Levi Fox, the Director of the Shakespeare Trust Birthplace, wrote an article on the birthplace which was published in the *Birmingham Post*. I at once sent in a letter drawing attention to the fact that the house now known as the birthplace was neither owned or occupied by Will Shaksper's father until eleven years after Shaksper had been born, and in any case the only part of the original house now remaining is the cellars, and I accused the Shake-



speare Trust of taking money under false pretences by charging the credulous visitors to Stratford the sum of 1/- for the privilege of gazing at a room in which they are told Shaksper was born, which is quite untrue.

Mr. Levi Fox then wrote a letter to the *Birmingham Post* in which he gave the whole show away, because he said the records at Stratford do not state precisely in which house William was born. I then wrote another letter to the *Birmingham Post* which they refused to print the excuse being, want of space. So I sent this letter on to Mr. Levi Fox, who sent me a post card saying, "It is not usual for me to take part in any controversy, so I shall not reply further."

I subsequently wrote a letter to Mr. Fox saying that I had publicly accused the Shakespeare Trust of taking money under false pretences, that this statement if not true, was libellous, and if it was libellous I should be grateful if the Shakespeare Trust would bring an action for libel against me, when the whole matter could be thrashed out and the public at last learn the truth about the Shakespeare birthplace.

You can guess the result, complete silence, because the last thing that the Shakespeare Trust want is any investigation into the history of the so called birthplace, which it knows quite well is a sham and a fraud on the public.

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON,  
President of the Francis Bacon Society

On 23rd April we shall have the usual reminder that "this is Shakespeare's birthday." But was it? It is, in fact, merely a token date as all we *do* know is that he was baptized on 26th April. There is no record as to the date of his birth, nor is it known as to where, in the Parish of Stratford-on-Avon, he was born. There is ample evidence that he was *not* born in the house shown as "The Birthplace," and which, moreover, bears no resemblance to the original cottage and butcher's shop which occupied the site before the construction of the present imposing building between 1858 and 1860. As his father purchased a house in Greenhill Street the year before he married, and as William was the eldest son, it is more likely that this was the scene of his birth.

I cannot help feeling that the facts must be known to the Custodian of "The Birthplace", but few of the visitors who pay for admission to the house, and to see "the room in which Shakespeare was born," can have any idea that it is a pretence.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE

Listeners who were surprised to learn the facts about the house known as "Shakespeare's Birthplace", as given by a correspondent in "Air Space" last week, may be further interested to know that the so-called "Anne Hathaway's Cottage" is another instance of misrepresentation. No reference to this cottage as having been the former home of Shakespeare's wife appeared until 1795, and then without the claim to any tradition to this effect.

Sir Edmund Chambers says, "Anne's parentage is not quite clear," but there was a farmer named Hathaway in Shotton, who had a

daughter named Agnes, and this Agnes is *assumed* to have been the Anne whom Shakespeare married. There is no record of the marriage in Stratford Church register, or elsewhere.

In the parlour of "Anne Hathaway's Cottage" is the famous "courting seat" beside the hearth. Far from there being any proof that the poet's wooing took place here, there is not a scrap of evidence that he ever entered this house. Yet how many visitors will still take the field-path from Stratford to the "Cottage" at Shottery under the fond impression that they will be seeing the very scene of Shakespeare's love-making? So, once again, is public credulity traded upon.

Yours sincerely,

R. J. W. Gentry

\* \* \* \*

An American friend, Mr. Johan Franco, informs us that his aria "Queen's Dream", written for dramatic soprano and orchestra, will be performed in September by the Symphony of the Air (formerly conducted by Toscanini) under David Brockman, with Shirlee Emmons as soloist. We have received a long-playing gramophone record of this work, privately recorded. Incidentally, Mr. Franco is sending additional copies of his pamphlet "Bacon-Shakespeare Identities Revealed by their Handwritings" (illustrated). We are, therefore, pleased to restore this to our list of pamphlets for sale on the back cover.



## "TOWARDS A MORE CORRECT BIOGRAPHY OF FRANCIS BACON"

(Extracts from an Essay by the late Parker Woodward)

### London in Elizabethan Times

TO understand the main *locus in quo* it is desirable to take note that London and Westminster in Sir Francis Bacon's day did not number a population of more than some two hundred thousand, and that, except within the city boundaries, the residents were very much spread out.

As shown faithfully in Norden's Map of Westminster, 1593, the Royal Court comprised a large district reaching from the River Thames to the Horse Guards. It included the new Palace of Whitehall (formerly Wolsey's York Palace or Place), the old Palace of Westminster, the Abbey or West Minster (St. Paul's in the city of London being the East Minster), and the sanctuary. It included also extensive subsidiary buildings, residences, guard-houses, and the like, for a numerous body of retainers and guards. The whole of the Court precincts was protected on the land side by high walls and postern gates, and the river front was equally well guarded. To be forbidden access to the Court was equivalent to a denial of entry upon practically the whole of Westminster.

Whitehall Palace and its gardens fronted the Thames, which river was the main, most frequent, and easiest means of communication with London and the Tower, with the residences of the noblemen along the Strand front, and with the Queen's Palaces at Greenwich, Hampton Court, Richmond and Windsor. The old Saxon Palace of Havering-atte-Bower, in Essex, was also partly reached by way of the Thames.

Next to the Whitehall Palace and Court, towards the Strand, was an area known as Scotland Yard. Then along the Strand, with garden reaching to the Thames, came the old residence of the Archbishops of York (at that time known as York House, and occupied by the Lord Keeper), and then Durham House and Garden, at one time the residence of the Bishops of Durham. Then successively were Bedford House, the old Savoy Palace, Somerset House (where Lord Hunsdon lived), Bath or Arundel House (residence of the Earl), and Leycester House (afterwards known as Essex House), occupied at one time by the Earl of Leicester, and next by one whose career had always been the special care of the Queen and Leicester—Robert, Earl of Essex. Most of the houses or palaces were taken from the Roman Catholic hierarchy at the time of the Reformation, and all their gardens bordered the Thames.

Between Leycester House and the boundary wall of London City was a large area formerly the centre and residence of the Knight Templars, but in Sir Francis Bacon's time occupied by the barristers, ancients, and law students of the Temple.

Farther east along the river front and within the city boundaries (but not subject to its jurisdiction, as it was Crown property) was another large area walled all round and entered only through postern gates, guarded in the daytime and locked at night. This with its large refectories and residential chambers, before the Order was suppressed and its property taken, was the home of the community of the Black Friars. Within the peacefulness of this protected district in Queen Elizabeth's reign certain Court Officials such as Lord Cobham, the ninth Earl of Northumberland, and the Earl of Oxford (who married a daughter of Lord Burleigh), were permitted to reside. It is also said that a certain "John Lyly" had at one time a lodging there.

One part of this disused monastery was used by the Master of Revels for storage of the scenery properties and costumes required for the masques and comedies performed for the amusement of the Royal Court. The performers were the chorister boys (known as the children of the Queen's Chapel) who were lodged at the old Savoy Palace, or they were the chorister boys of St. Paul's, called the Paul's children. These boy-players were rehearsed in their parts in a large room of the old monastery, where full performances were sometimes actually given. What is now known as Playhouse Yard adjoined it. Later, a room or theatre which Burbage built and the Earl of Oxford rented was made use of.

### Boyhood

With an ambiguity that must surely have been intentional, Rawley states in his biography that Bacon was born at "York House or York Place." By this he is suggesting that the birth might have taken place at Wolsey's new Palace of Whitehall, York Place, where Queen Elizabeth lived, and not necessarily at York House (the old residence of the Archbishops of York) where the Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, then resided. Rawley could have been quite definite on this point, but in his preface he distinctly says that he is recording such facts as are "communicable to the public", and that "without treading too near upon the heels of truth."

Francis Bacon was christened with these names at St. Martin's -in-the-Fields Church, and was brought up as the younger son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Ann Bacon, living either at York House in London, or at Gorhambury near St. Alban's.

Tradition is that the Queen frequently took notice of him. At his age of twelve she went specially to Gorhambury House, and a terracotta bust of the boy (which suggests abnormal brain development) was made for that occasion. No bust of Anthony Bacon is recorded, although he was the presumed elder son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Ann. Francis was tutored in music, in Latin, Greek, French, and Italian, and possibly in fencing. His French tutor was Amias Paulet, son of the Protestant governor of Jersey, of which island French is the spoken and written language to this day. His Italian tutor was John Florio, son of an Italian Protestant refugee preacher, who at one time was employed by Lord Burleigh. Edvardo Donati was very possibly his tutor for music. Bonetti, who took over the rooms at Blackfriars occupied in the name



of "John Lyly", was likely to have been his fencing-master. At the age of thirteen following a visit of the Queen to Gorhambury House, Francis was sent with Anthony Bacon to Cambridge University. He did not go to St. Bennet's College, where Sir Nicholas had been educated, but to Trinity College, founded by Henry VIII, and visited by the Queen and Earl of Leicester in 1564. Here he was placed in charge of Whitgift, the head of the college, who was one of the Queen's private chaplains. After events show that at Cambridge he was tutored in rhetoric and poetry by a popular young professor named Gabriel Harvey, and that with him he formed a warm friendship.

In the summer of 1574 plague raged in England, and the Queen would seem to have sent Francis into France in charge of Amias Paulet, his French tutor. Because of the plague Cambridge University was closed until March, 1574/5. Evidence as to the visit to France is suggested in a letter from Francis to Robert Cecil of January, 1594/5, in which he says, "these one and twenty years (for so long it is that I kissed Her Majesty's hands upon my journey into France)." In a letter to Robert, Earl of Essex, of about the same date, he corrects himself, "these twenty years (for so long it is, and more since I went with Sir Amyas Paulet into France from her Majesty's royal hand)."

More than twenty years back from January, 1594/5 would be in the year 1574. When or whether Francis went back to college does not seem clear, but he left finally in December, 1575. During the period January to September, 1575/6, Francis was frequently at the Royal Court, where he came into friendly relationship with his cousin, Sir Philip Sidney, and with Fulke Greville, both interested in poetry and both writers of verse.

It is not certain whether he met Vere, Earl of Oxford (another poet) until later. Francis seems to have tried his hand at a play for the Chapel children, as in 1576† a play called *Historie of Errors* was performed at Hampton Court before the Queen. The play would be a translation from the Latin play of the "Menoechmi" written by Plautus, the comic dramatist.

If we can judge by the play as revised in the Shakespeare folio it must have been poor stuff but a beginning anyway.

It is quite possible that he was present and helped over the entertainment of the Queen at Kenilworth Castle in July, 1575, and wrote the published account of the affair, and the "Laneham letter" from the Court at Worcester. Mr. E. G. Harman, C.B., has argued this possibility very fully in his work on *Spenser*.‡

The internal evidence rather suggests that Francis wrote the ten pages affixed in 1575 to Gascoigne's poesies called "Certayne Notes of Instruction concerning the making of Verse or Ryme in English." He may have intended them to help his music tutor, Donati.

---

†i.e. when Bacon was sixteen, having finished his education, and Shaksper was twelve and apprenticed to a butcher.

‡*Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon* (Constable 1914)

In the year 1576 it was decided to send him abroad for a long stay. At first Edward Bacon, ten years his senior, was to go with him and in June, 1576, a licence to the two of them, with coach and six horses to travel was issued. Plans were, however, changed. Edward Bacon went without Francis. Amias Paulet was knighted and put in charge of Francis, and they crossed the Channel into France in September.

A Mr. Duncombe was also sent with Francis, as tutor. Sir Amias Paulet succeeded Dr. Dale as Ambassador to France in February of the following year, 1576/7. Paulet and Francis moved along in attendance at the French Court, visiting Blois, Paris, Poitiers, and other places. Francis came back to England in 1578. He must have been back some considerable time, as the Queen's private Court limner, Hilliard, painted a miniature of him. A portrait of Robert, Earl of Essex, was at a later date also painted by Hilliard. In 1853 this portrait was in the collection of the Earl of Verulam at Gorhambury. Francis would seem to have had time to assist his Italian tutor, Florio, to publish his *First Fruits* (Italian sentences with English translations), and possibly to have added verses to it in the name of "Gosson."

In the same name Francis contributed a short poem to a book about the West Indies. Gosson was a boy-player in the Queen's service. While at the French Court young Francis must have met and become friendly with both Montaigne the essayist and Descartes the poet. Later in his life Francis showed considerable interest in both these literary Frenchmen. While in France he possibly began writing *Euphues Anatomy of Wit*, subsequently referred to as "my first counterfeit" (dissembling), and then added further chapters before its publication in England in 1579.

"Euphues", according to *The Schoolmaster* written by Ascham, the Queen's old tutor, in 1570, meant, "he that is apt by goodness of wit and applicable by readiness of will to learning."

### Early Manhood

Francis returned from Paris to England in March, 1578/9, and would then have learned of the death in the previous month of his foster-father, Sir Nicholas Bacon. He mentions in one of his books that the latter had a premonition of his death.

On his return he plunged actively into writing books to add to English literature, which he had found most deficient both in quantity and quality. One has only to examine the Stationers' Register for that period to confirm the truth of this statement. Stimulated by the activities of French poets towards improving the French language and extending French literature, he made similar efforts concerning the language and literature of England, over which "realm" he had hope of one day being called to "rule." It was not until his hopes in this regard were very much dashed that he openly published the first edition of his *Essays* in 1597; for circumstances had previously demanded that nothing should be printed over his own name as author. Thus the task he essayed was rendered more difficult, for he could not print too much in one name without causing suspicion.



He began a pamphlet discussion upon the subject of the improvement of English music and poetry, and the importance, educationally, of stage-plays.† At that date plays had been banned in the city, and strolling men-players subjected to specially restrictive laws. Certain men-players had escaped the operation of these laws by being made the "servants" of the Earl of Leicester, the Earl of Warwick, or other wealthy noblemen. Yet stage-plays had somehow to be justified to the public; so some correspondence upon the subject between the player Stephen Gosson and another man-player, Thomas Lodge (a poor scholar or servitor of Oxford, son of a bankrupt city alderman) was organised and published. In this same year Francis closely studied the writings of Chaucer and brought out an Emblem Kalendar, for which he wrote the verses and probably drew (and very badly too) the emblems. He seems to have printed it anonymously at the turn of the year 1579-80 and called it the "Shepherds Kalendar." He dedicated it to his friend and cousin, Sir Philip Sidney, signing himself "Immerito", and prefaced it with the following highly significant lines.

*Go, little Book: thy self present  
As child whose Parent is unkent,  
To him that is the President  
Of Noblenesse and Chivalrie . . .*

*. . . But if that any ask thy name  
Say, thou wert base-begot with blame:  
For why thereof thou takest shame.  
And when thou art past jeopardy,  
Come tell me what was said of me,  
And I will send more after thee.*

IMMERITO

A clerk named Edmund Spenser who seems to have been in Earl Leicester's service left for employment in Ireland in July, 1580. Immediately after Spenser's departure Francis seems to have printed three letters, and then two letters which had passed between himself and his poetry tutor Gabriel Harvey on the subject of the reform of English verse. The "Francis" letters were signed "Immerito."

Late in 1580 Francis was ready with *Euphues his England* (Lyly), containing a clever commentary upon the English Court as he found it on his return from France, but concluding with high praise of the Queen. In September, however, he was very much perturbed at an order, through Burleigh, that he was to go into Gray's Inn and study law. He protested in a letter to Burleigh that he could not understand how anyone "well off or friended should be put to the study of the common laws" instead of "studies of greater delight." By October the matter was adjusted, the Queen appointing him to a position in her service (which appears to have been that of writing and rehearsing

†A theme which he was later to develop in the *Advancement of Learning*, Book VII.

comedies for boy-players at the revels), and making some provision for his maintenance. Rich Sir Nicholas Bacon (in a quite recent will in which he certainly mentions him) left him practically nothing.

He was soon discontented with the Gray's Inn restrictions and, according to an entry in Burleigh's handwriting (still amongst the Inn records) was excused from compulsory attendance at commons. Six years later came an order that he was to have his meals at the Benchers' table, although not entitled (by seniority, or otherwise) to the innovation.

Francis, having now attained twenty-one years, seems to have entered upon a year's travel abroad, according to the practice of the period for the well-born. Anthony Bacon, who was in Europe, was consulted as to the best route. He wrote to Lord Burleigh in February, 1580/1, advising the road to be taken. The Discourse prefaced to *L'Histoire naturelle*, 1631, distinctly states that Francis had travelled both in Italy and Spain. It will be shown later that in all probability Francis himself inspired this Discourse.

On 19th October, 1581, Francis was in Orleans, to which place Sir Thomas Bodley (the Queen's gentleman-usher), on behalf of certain "Friends" sent money arriving in December, and required him to make diligent enquiries into matters of State importance.

To judge from his *Apophthegms*, Francis was familiar with the writings of the Greek lyric poet Simonides, noted for the melody, sweetness, and elaborate finish of his verses. Now the year in that period did not date from 1st January, but from 25th March, so that a book printed between 1st January and 25th March, 1582, would be dated 1581. In 1581 a book called *Don Simonides* (first part) was printed giving an account of travel in Italy and Spain, and finishing up with a visit in London to an old friend called "Philautus." It is not of immediate import to identify "Philautus," but he was probably the friend mentioned in the *Anatomy of Wit*, in *Euphues his England* and later in some "Green" and "Lodge" Nouvelles. It could hardly have been a reference to Sir Philip Sidney, whose sobriquet was "Philsides." It might have referred to his friend the poet, Vere, Earl of Oxford, who married a daughter of Lord Burleigh. But it is more probable that the references are to the Earl of Leicester, as Philautus (Self-Love) and that Camilla (the name of the Virgin Queen of the Volscians), wife of Philautus, referred to Queen Elizabeth. *Don Simonides* is, however, title-paged to one Barnabe Rich, a soldier back from long service in the Low Countries, and of the estimated age at that date of forty. The question to be considered is "Was Rich merely another accommodating mask for Francis?" If not the coincidences are extraordinary; for Francis would obviously keep notes on his visit to Spain and Italy, and "Philautus" was already his friend.

While on the subject of funds, observe the Bodley letter rather gives away the chaplain Rawley's later attempt at an explanation of the virtual non-provision for Francis in the Nicholas Bacon will. If there had been a few hundreds coming to him when of age, he would have had funds enough of his own to complete his journey. Whereas



it is notable that Francis, who seems to have been very open about his monetary affairs, never at any time alluded to receiving money from Sir Nicholas. On the other hand, the Bodley letter refers to certain "friends" as providing funds.

The only intelligible explanation seems to be that Francis wrote *Don Simonides*, of which a second part was published in 1584; and to cover up the matter, he inspired the printing of the only other book title-paged to Rich in 1581—namely, *A Farewell to the Military Profession*. The prefatory remarks in that book are significant and would have served to establish Rich as a writer (although an old soldier of over forty !) thus providing the inky fluid amidst which Francis could print his own translations into English from the French of Belleforet, and of eight tales by the Italians Bandello and Boccaccio.

Upon one of these tales, "Apollonius and Silla", the Shakespeare play of *Twelfth Night* is said to have been founded. It would be interesting to find out after all that Francis selected his own raw material of that play from the same translator—viz. Belleforet—from whom he also obtained subject-matter for *Hamlet*.

The *Farewell* shows how this studious young man had filled up his spare time abroad. So does the translation of the *Antigone* of Sophocles, printed 1581 in the name of "Watson." So does the *Passionate Centurie of Love*, printed a few months later under the same pen-name of "Watson." This last-named book contains a large number of exercises in sonnet writing, most of the styles of the leading sonnet writers of the period being copied, and the majority of instances being founded upon the best Italian sonnet poets. Hallam in his work upon the *Literature of Europe* states that the Italian sonnets alone of that period occupied 661 volumes.

The "Watson" sonnets are dedicated to the author's friend, Vere, Earl of Oxford, who had married a daughter of Lord Burleigh. Francis turned his attention to the Revells, writing some "Lyly" plays for performance by the Queen's Chapel children, but in July he got into trouble with the Queen. This explains why a "Lyly" letter should have been considered of sufficient importance to have been preserved amongst Burleigh's records. It was suggested by the late Mr. Fleay that the trouble was the performance publicly of the comedy of *Sapho and Phao* which contained a number of allusions of no harm in the privy circle of the Queen, but undesirable for the general public. However, Francis seems to have made his apology to Burleigh, signing it with the name "John Lyly", under which, as the author of the comedy, he had masked himself.

The "Notes" which Francis seems to have made upon the *States of Christendom* were not printed in his lifetime, the reason, of course, being that they were for the private information of himself and the Queen and her ministers. They cover ground that he may not have entirely covered physically in the time at his disposal, but they accord very fully with a journey made in 1581. He would have learnt in France that the Queen Dowager of Austria had left Vienna in the previous August, that the Diet of Augsburg was fixed to be held in

July, 1581/2, and that preparations were being made in France to help the fugitive King of Portugal in June, 1581/2.

### Euphuism

A good deal of criticism has been devoted to showing that the style of writing which first was made manifest in the *Anatomy of Wit* and in *Euphuus His England* had caught like an infection a number of writers whose works appeared shortly after those publications. Perhaps literary critics have failed to appreciate how difficult the style would have been for prolonged imitation.

The truth is that the style was nothing more or less than the original prose style of the young poet Francis, who, according to Hilliard, had developed mental powers of a very high order, and evidently wrote with a good conceit of his own abilities. "Greene" the ascribed author, "Lodge" the ascribed author, "Lyly", "Watson", "Gosson" and "Rich" also, all evinced proof of the infection for the simple reason that their supposed "works" were either written or extensively edited by one and the same man—viz. Francis—in his ordinary youthful and bumptious style. To many present day readers the young poet's euphuistic style is irritating. Undoubtedly clever, it has a note of cocksureness which only a pert young aristocrat would assume. For the same reason traces of the style are to be found in some of the "Shakespeare" plays.

Robert Greene was a player in the Earl of Leicester's company whom Francis may well have paid for the use of his name. Like Gosson, he had been in his youth one of the Queen's Chapel choristers, and when too old had been sent as a poor boy to Cambridge. He was back in London in 1583, and obtained a post in the Chapel Royal in charge of the boys. See, "Old Cheque-Book of the Chapel Royal."

*Mamillia*, a tale entered on the Stationers' Register in 1580 while Greene was away at Cambridge, was the first publication which in 1583 he may have put out in the name of Greene as author. Other tales ascribed to the name of "Robert Greene" quickly followed—viz. *Morando*, *Arbasto*, *Myrrour of Modestie*, *Carde of Fancie*, and *Debate between Folly and Love*.

If the "Greene" biographers are to be believed, "Greene" caught the euphuistic infection directly he had contemplated becoming an author in 1580, which is absurd.

In 1584 Francis was elected Member of Parliament for two constituencies—viz. Melcombe and Gatton—and wrote a careful and affectionate letter of advice to the Queen, whose life was in some danger from turbulent subjects. It commenced: "Care one of the natural and true-bred children of unfeigned affection awaked with these late wicked and barbarous attempts would needs exercise my pen to your Sacred Majesty." In June of that year the Queen made Greene Vicar of Tollesbury in Essex, a step in which the influence of Francis may be surmised.

It was a curious coincidence that only a serious treatise on astronomy proceeded from "Greene's" supposed reverent pen. It was



called *Planetomachia*, and in it the author is described as a "Student in Physicke". It is dedicated to the Earl of Leicester. The motto "*Omne tullit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci*", which Francis, as Immerito, quoted in one of his 1580 letters to Harvey, was habitually placed on the title-pages of books ascribed to Robert Greene.

Here are the sequent changes in the career of the alleged author—*viz.*, chorister, sizar, Sub-Dean of the Chapel Royal, man-player, parson, man-player again, then parson once more. For in the following year, 1585, Greene resigned his living and went abroad as one of the Earl of Leicester's men-players, being known as the "red-nosed minister" and as "Robert the Parson." The other "Greene" books of 1584 were severally dedicated to Lord Darcie, the Earl of Arundel, Lady Talbot, the Countess of Derby, and the Earl of Oxford. Their publication would be either in 1583/4 or 1584/5.

Production of euphuistic novels did not stop in 1584. *Forbonius and Prisceria* appeared title-paged to another man-player, the already mentioned Thomas Lodge. With it was bound a pamphlet called *An Alarum against Usurers*. In the Preface to these Lodge books they are called "these primordia (first-fruits) of my studies". They were dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney. Now, it is well known that Francis was frequently in the hands of money-lenders, which should account for his warnings about them. In 1584 Lady Ann Bacon let him have a sufficient interest in her estate of Markes, in Essex, to enable him to raise £1,200 upon mortgage in 1591; presumably her consent had not been obtained until that date.

About 1584 were printed two Court Comedies, *Campaspe*, and *Saphao and Phao* (already mentioned) in the name of "Lyly." Another play for Chapel children, in which the author had experimented in various metres and called the *Arraignement of Paris*, was printed anonymously. A Latin version of Tasso's *Amintas* was also printed, in the name of "Watson." Of course some of these publications would not necessarily be printed in the year 1583/4, but would come into the year 1584/5.

(to be continued)

# ROBERT DUDLEY, EARL OF LEICESTER

By R. J. W. GENTRY

**I**N 1727 there was published *The Life of Robert Earl of Leicester, the Favourite of Queen Elizabeth: Drawn from original Writers and Records*. This ably written book was by Samuel Jebb. In his preface he says: "The reign of Queen Elizabeth was not more eminently distinguished by the bright example of her own virtues, than by the conduct and capacity of her ministers. Born with a genius, superior to the common race of Princes, she gave the earliest marks of her abilities to govern, by the choice she made of fit persons to be employ'd in the management of her affairs. If ever partiality and affection seem to have oversway'd her judgment, 'twas in the case of the Earl of Leicester, upon whom she pour'd wealth and honours with so liberal a hand, as to make him at once the envy of her great men at home, and the admiration of all her neighbouring Princes abroad. And yet, were we to form an idea of his merit from the general accounts that have been transmitted to us, we should find little amiable in his character, but his person and address, which should seem to have been too weak inducements to procure the favour of so wise a Princess."

Here, then, we have a somewhat puzzling situation—Queen Elizabeth, a sovereign wise and adroit in her choice of ministers, makes an especial favourite of a man whom common report has stigmatised as a blackguard.

Camden, the Father of Elizabethan historians, essayed three suggestions to account for this enigma. In Book One of his *Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth* . . . he asks: was there "a Vertue of his, whereof he gave some shadowed tokens" to her alone? Or did he owe his success to "their common condition of imprisonment under Queen Mary," when they faced death together at twenty? Or should the explanation rather be looked for in "nativity and the hidden consent of the stars at the hour of his birth, and therefore a straight conjunction of their minds?"

Among these three hypotheses, Camden hesitates to pronounce judgment: "A man cannot easily say." But in Book Three, reverting to the topic of Leicester, he concludes at last that it must have been through "a certain conjunction of their minds, and that haply through a hidden conjunction of the stars (which the Greek astrologers term *Synaestria*) . . ." As to this, however, it must be remembered that Dudley was born on the 24th June, 1533, and Elizabeth on the 7th September of the same year.

Is there another, and weightier reason? Is it true that Robert Dudley became the secret husband of the Queen?

Now, of course, the most categorical affirmation of this notion is to be found in Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup's book *The Bi-literal Cipher of Francis Bacon*. For example, on p.22 of the 1901 edition we find, as a decipherment from Francis Bacon's *Declaration of the Treasons*



*Attempted and Committed by the Earl of Essex* (1601) the following sentence: "Que. Elizabeth and Robert, th' Earle o' Leicester, were join'd lawfully in wedlock before my comming." Here is another, on p.75, deciphered from *The Whole Contention Betweene the Houses of York and Lancaster* (1619): "...he who thus demanded right was sonne to the Queene, th' first to blesse her union with Robert Dudley whilst a prisoner in the Tower." Again, on p.359 is the deciphered statement taken out of Bacon's *Natural History*: "hee (this refers to Dudley) did live, the unacknowledg'd husband of Queene Elizabeth, my mother."

We can be in no doubt, then, that belief in the Gallup cipher story directly entails belief in the marriage of Dudley to Elizabeth. This particular account, being a revelation of secret contemporary events, had to be imbedded in cipher to ensure its preservation for the eyes of posterity without arousing the keen suspicions of the State spies of that time. Every effort, we may suppose, would naturally have been made by the interested parties themselves to obliterate any evidence of their secret, such as documents, unreliable people "in the know" who might have talked, or any overt behaviour on their own part conducive to gossip. It was a *secret*, and had to be stringently maintained as such; hence definite factual evidence would necessarily be most difficult to come by.

However, let us gather together what strands we may—some of one colour (which tend to support the notion that Dudley *did* marry Elizabeth), some of another (which would make this untenable), and see which lot will wind together to make the stronger thread of reasonable discourse.

First of all, who *was* Robert Dudley, and how did he happen ever to come in contact with Elizabeth at all? Born on the 24th of June, 1533, he was the fifth son of John Dudley, who had advanced to the position of Duke of Northumberland under the young Edward VI, but who lost his head upon the block on Mary's accession. He had attempted to set Mary aside and place his son's wife, Lady Jane Grey, upon the throne. Lady Jane was the eldest daughter of the Duchess of Suffolk and also cousin to the boy-king, Edward. She had married Lord Guildford Dudley; both were executed by Mary.

Now Robert had been committed to the Tower under sentence of death for complicity in his father's plot. At the same time in the Tower was the Princess Elizabeth, also under suspicion of having instigated Sir Thomas Wyatt to strike in her behalf against Mary. Elizabeth was of the same age as Dudley (twenty), and as prisoners of high degree were often not closely confined, was probably able to see and converse with him.

Not only was *Robert* under sentence for treason; not only had his *father* been executed for treason; but also his *grandfather* had gone to the scaffold. This man was the notorious Sir Edmund Dudley, who was a Privy Councillor of Henry VII and who devised, with Sir Richard Empson, the grinding taxation that gratified their master but made their names hateful to the people. Henry VIII, to acquire popular applause at his accession, turned them both over to the headsman.

Now when we go just one stage further back in the Dudley family history, we come to Robert's great-grandfather, another John Dudley. According to Erdswike's *View of Staffordshire*, this John Dudley was nothing more than a travelling carpenter, born at Dudley, Worcestershire. But, says Dugdale, this is unlikely, because he did marry Elizabeth Bramshot, a member of a good family of some wealth. It is probable, therefore, that John Dudley *was* a gentleman, though not perhaps of the Baron of Dudley's line, as was claimed later. The earlier history of the Dudley family is, thus, obscure.

After both Robert Dudley and the Princess Elizabeth managed to emerge unscathed from the terrors of the Tower, and she succeeded to the throne, rather unexpectedly, there soon became evident to all a very marked inclination of the queenly favour towards the handsome young courtier. By the 27th of September, 1559, he had been appointed her Master of the Horse, invested with the Order of the Garter, created Baron of Denbigh, and ultimately elevated to the earldom of Leicester.

Now why did Elizabeth so signally and rapidly honour this scion of treasonable stock, this "upstart," as he was regarded in so many aristocratic and courtly eyes? Was there any strange hidden reason to account for his phenomenal preferment over all the other numerous handsome young men about the Queen? Was it love, physical attraction, or her recognition of his ability?

What was Dudley like in person? David Lloyd, in his *Statesmen and Favourites of England* (1665) thus describes him: "He was a very goodly person and singular well featured, and all his youth well favoured, and of a sweet aspect, but high foreheaded, which was taken to be of no discommendation: but towards his latter end grew high-coloured and red-faced." Samuel Jebb (*Life of Robert Dudley*, 1727) avouchs the following: "He is said to have been furnished with all possible advantages both of body and mind. His person was comely, and well-proportioned, his countenance open and liberal, his behaviour affable and engaging; and to these were added a graceful action and delivery, and such an absolute command of temper, that he could naturally adapt himself to every man's humour or designs, as he saw occasion."

Certainly Dudley had an outward aspect which would readily prepossess the daughter of Henry VIII in his favour. Now what of his *mental* quality?

Roger Ascham had early a high opinion of it. He later expressed regret that Dudley had preferred mathematics to classics, and praised 'the abiliting of inditing that is in you naturally' (Ascham, *Works*, ed. Giles, ii. 104). Ascham wrote often of Dudley's literary taste. The *D.N.B.* states that: "Gabriel Harvey devoted the second book of his 'Congratulationes Valdinenses,' London, 1578, to (Dudley's) praises, and printed eulogies by Pietro Bizari, Carlus Utenhovius, Walter Haddon, Abraham Hartwell and Edward Grant. Geoffrey Whitney, when dedicating to (Dudley) his *Choice of Emblems* (1586) states that "many famous men had been enabled to pursue their studies through his beneficence."



He showed an interest in the drama, despite his support of Puritan controversialists. As early as 1571 'Lord Leicester's Men' performed a play before the Queen, when she was visiting Saffron Walden. "In succeeding years the same company of actors is often mentioned in the accounts of the office of revels. On the 7th of May, 1574, the first royal patent granted to actors in this country was conceded to the Earl of Leicester in behalf of his actor-servants, at whose head stood James Burbage." (*D.N.B.*) Leicester became Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Jebb says: "In his entrance upon this office, he found the University in a most deplorable condition. . . he labour'd by all possible means to introduce an improvement in Literature, and give a new turn to the face of affairs in the University. By his letters he recommended to 'em the practice of Religion and Learning, and press'd 'em to a more close observance of their duty. This application was not without its effect; provision was immediately made for reforming abuses in Graces and Dispensations, Lectures and publick Exercises were enforc'd by statute, and the Habits brought under regulation."

So much for the attractive side of Dudley's vivid personality. Jebb has a note on its other side. He says: "But lust and ambition were his prevailing passions, and he stands charged with having practised the most horrible and incredible villanies, that he might obtain the gratification of his inordinate desires." Lloyd, too, mentions habits that would not redound to the Earl's credit: "A man was oppressed if he complied with him, and undone if he opposed him. In a word, his design was thought a Crown, his parts too large for a subject, his interest too great for a servant, his depth not fathomable in those days, and his policy not reached in these."

Let us turn now to consider that phrase: "his design was thought a Crown." What in the way of evidence is there that Dudley was actually themorganatic husband of Queen Elizabeth?

Amy Robsart, whom Dudley had married in 1550, was still alive at the end of March, 1560. She, undoubtedly, would have been a great obstacle in the way of any plans Dudley may have formed to have a "marriage" with Elizabeth openly avowed. As Milton Waldman remarks (*Elizabeth and Leicester*): "Apparently superfluous wives were as hard to kill in England as mischievous upstarts. . . He (Dudley) 'told somebody, who has not kept silent, that he will be in a very different position a year from now, if he lived.'" But, to disarm the growing suspicion of his designs among the nobles, he gave open support to the project of Elizabeth's marriage with the Archduke Charles, son of the Holy Roman Emperor and Spain's official candidate. "Through his sister Mary, Lady Sidney, he approached Feria's successor, the Bishop de Quadra, with the assurance that if the Archduke came in person Elizabeth would accept him." (Waldman).

De Feria had made an announcement on 18th of April, 1559, about Elizabeth's being in love with Dudley and mentions this rumour as being rife "*during the last few days.*" De Feria was the most important ambassador at the Court, and Waldman says that, had the affair been going on much longer, "it seems inconceivable that Feria's and

the other ambassadors' paid ferrets would not have found it out sooner. This would seem to dispose of the antiquaries' later tale of a love affair in the Tower."

Undoubtedly there were rumours bruited among even the common people that the real reason of Elizabeth's not acceding to the many marriage proposals being judiciously pressed upon her by her statesmen was that she had set her heart on a man she could not have. "They say she is in love with Lord Robert Dudley and never lets him leave her."

Certain persons were actually arraigned and punished for giving voice to the general suspicions. Robert Brooke of Devizes, Marsham the schoolmaster, Anne Dowe of Brentford, were all summarily dealt with for uttering the slander that the Queen had had children by the Earl of Leicester. Among the Cecil Papers at Hatfield is a document endorsed by Cecil: "Drunken burlegh of Totness, Februar 1560." This records the examination of one John Whyte, who alleged that a Thomas Burley "known by the name of the drunken Burley, hadde said to hym in his own howse that the Lord Robert Dudley dyd swive the Quene, etc." It goes on to indicate that the offenders were committed to the next sessions at Exeter. In the same collection are two declarations of an Arthur Gunter, one "concerning the report that the Queen was to marry Lord Robert Dudley"; and the other, of 26th October, 1560, to George Cotton, "that ere this my Lord Robert's wife is dead, and she broke her neck, but it is a number of beads that the Queen will marry him. If she do, you shall see a great stir, for my Lord is sure of the Earl of Pembroke; and the Lord Rich, with diverse others, be ready, with the putting up of his finger, and then you shall see the White Horse bestir himself, for my Lord is a great power, but a man shall have a ruffian with a dag to dispatch him out of a shop."

On 11th September, 1560, De Quadra wrote a letter to Margaret of Parma, Regent of the Netherlands for Philip II, in which he tells of an interview Cecil had with him. Cecil, it seems, was in great apprehension about the way events were beginning to turn, and evinced a strong wish to retire in order to escape the storm rising through Elizabeth's behaviour with Dudley. He even mentioned a plan to kill Amy Robsart. Now this same letter of De Quadra's, in the words of Milton Waldman: ". . . begins with the statement that the writer arrived at Windsor '*cinco dias ha*', that is Friday the 6th, describes an audience of some duration with the Queen, then 'after these conversations' his meeting with Cecil, and goes on immediately to add, 'The day after this took place the Queen told me, on her return from hunting, that Lord Robert's wife was dead, or nearly so, and begged me to say nothing about it'." The most important diplomat in England, come to discuss essential business with the Queen, would not have been kept waiting long for his audience; he may even have arranged it beforehand. It is therefore probable that De Quadra saw Elizabeth not later than Saturday the 7th; and though he does not say so, the tone of his letter distinctly implies that he spoke with Cecil shortly afterwards on the same day, when he heard from the Secretary that Amy was about



to die. In that event 'the day after' on which Elizabeth informed him that Amy was already 'dead or nearly so' refers to the fatal Sunday itself, and the phrase 'on her return from hunting' to some time before eleven in the morning . . . with Bowes (the servant at Cumnor Place) still many hours' hard riding away. It seems to follow, then, that Elizabeth, informed by Robert in advance that he had sent to kill his wife, precisely as Cecil had foretold, through some misunderstanding of the day on which the crime was to be perpetrated, gave it away *before it happened*, or at least before the news could have arrived at Windsor". Amy Robsart was found with her neck broken at the bottom of a flight of stairs on Sunday, 8th September, 1560.

The circumstances of her death were undoubtedly suspicious. Dr. Francis Babington, one of Dudley's chaplains, preached the sermon at the funeral service for Amy Robsart at St. Mary's Church, Oxford, on Sunday the 22nd September. He is said to have tripped once and described the lady as 'pitifully slain', according to the book known as *Leycester's Commonwealth*. (Ashmole, *Antiquities of Berkshire*).

The author of the *Yorkshire Tragedy* obviously wrote in reference to the scandalous charge of murder hinted at Dudley in the lines:

The surest way to chain a woman's tongue  
Is break her neck—a politician did it.

But it must be stated, in justice to Dudley, that the only direct surviving account of the circumstances immediately surrounding Amy's death is in five letters exchanged between Dudley and Thomas Blount, his confidential servant, who went down in his behalf to Cumnor Hall on the fatal Sunday. "The original letters have disappeared, and their content is only known through copies preserved at the Pepysian Library at Cambridge. The copies appear (according to experts) to be in Blount's hand, and may have been made by him to submit in answer to an accusation brought against Robert in 1567 by John Appleyard, Amy's half-brother. A strong argument for their fidelity is the fact that the suspicious passages were not deleted in the copying." (Waldman).

Incidentally it is interesting to note that Cecil served on the committee of the Privy Council which punished John Appleyard for putting forward the suggestion of foul play. This doesn't seem consistent with De Quadra's statements about Cecil's remarks to him concerning the complicity of Dudley in the murder of his wife. Another point about De Quadra (who disliked Dudley) is that, although he had all the remarkable budget of news for his master ready for dispatch on the 8th September, the day of Amy Robsart's death, yet he unaccountably dallied in the sending of it till the 11th.

Canon Jackson, in the *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1882, argues very strongly for Leicester's innocence of Amy's death. Waldman, too, is of the opinion that the best theory to fit the known facts is *suicide*.

But in 1584 there was printed on the Continent, probably at Antwerp, a book which excited much interest. The title it then bore was: "Copie of a Leter Wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambridge to

his friend in London," but we know it now as *Leycesters Commonwealth*, its 1641 title. (I have a copy of a reprinting by Dr. Drake in 1706, which he terms the "Secret Memoirs of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester.") No one knows even now who the real author was; it was attributed to Robert Parsons, the Jesuit, and as it happened to be bound, rather unusually, in green, it was colloquially known as "Father Parson's Greencoat." However, a letter preserved in the MS. Collections of William Cole adduces internal evidence to show that Parsons could not have written the book, but that it was the work "of some subtle courtier, who, for safety got it printed abroad, and sent into England under the name of Parsons."

The book has been described as "one of the most inveterate and scurrilous libels which the religious dissensions of the times, prolific as they were, had produced . . . In its pages everything was raked together which the tongue of scandal had uttered to the disparagement of the exalted statesman whom it strove to overwhelm with obloquy, and where that was silent the imagination of the writer was not slow in filling up the void, and in supplying materials which were characterised by all the venom and rancour that the most ruthless hatred could suggest." (*Miscellaneous Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, 1893). The Queen in Council on June 20th, 1585, found it necessary to repudiate the assertions contained in the work. In a letter addressed to the magistrates of Cheshire, she writes: 'Her Highness not only knoweth to assured certainty the books and libels against the said Earl to be most malicious, false and scandalous, and such as none but an incarnate devil himself could dream to be true.'

This proves the book had a considerable circulation in England; but the great collector, Thomas Grenville, wrote in a MS. copy (British Museum) "I never heard of more than one copy having been in print of this first edition, so carefully was it suppressed." (These facts are from the Introduction to his edition of 1904 by Frank J. Burgoyne).

The book, if true, is a very dark indictment indeed of Robert Dudley's moral character. Sir Philip Sidney, his nephew, replied to it, but rather feebly. Another tract, *The History of Reynard the Fox*, sets forth what it terms the "violence and rapaciousness, the craft and dissimulation of the Earl of Leicester." In Thomas Nash's *Pierce Penilesse* (1592) there occurs a fable, or parable, of the Bear, the Lion, the Fox, the Camel and the Ape. It is suspected that the Bear represents Leicester; the Lion, Elizabeth; the Fox, Burghley. The Ape may be Simier, as he was known by that title on account of his name (*Simia*, Latin, an ape). Nash gives the Bear the same character as the tract already mentioned does to Leicester.

It might be well to see whether anything can definitely be said against the contention that Queen Elizabeth could have loved such a man as Dudley, and actually have married him. There is evidence that the Queen sent instructions, after listening to Cecil's suggestion of Dudley's marrying the Queen of Scots, to Randolph, her Ambassador in Scotland to dissuade the alliance with the Archduke Charles of Austria. She also sent a secret commission to the Earl of Murray and



Secretary Lidington to propose Dudley. (Camden, and Melvil's *Memoirs*). Elizabeth said she "would have married Dudley herself if she had not determined to end her days in virginity."

Inferiority of birth appears indeed to have been the great objection on her Majesty's side. She had been heard to say, What judgment would foreign powers, and the King of Spain in particular, pass upon her actions, if she should prefer a private subject to the first Princes of Europe? (Strada, *De Bello Belgic*, lib. 7). She frankly declared to the Scottish Ambassador, Sir James Melvil, that she looked upon Dudley as her brother, and her best friend, and that had she ever designed to have married, her inclination would have led her to make choice of him for her husband. (Melvil's *Memoirs*).

And some time after, when a Monsieur de Castelnau, the Ambassador of France, was pressing this match by orders of the French Court, she told him, that if the Earl of Leicester had been descended of a royal family, she would have readily consented to the motion he had made in his master's name, but she could never resolve to marry with a subject of her own, or to raise a dependant into a companion.

She herself swore several years later, on what she believed to be her deathbed 'that though she loved, and always had loved, Lord Robert, as God was her witness, nothing improper had ever passed between them.'

Her contemporary, Camden, who had access to much secret history, records that 'men cursed Huic, the Queen's physician, for dissuading her from marriage for I know not what female infirmity.' The intimate correspondence between the statesmen who spent the best part of their lives persuading her to marry (including Cecil, Camden's principal source of information on such matters) testified to her freedom from any female infirmity more serious than a chronic inability to make up her mind. Waldman says: "Each item of evidence cancels out another, and the whole mass seems to add up to nothing." (*Elizabeth and Leicester*, p.69).

Is this decision of Waldman's the one that finds widest acceptance among Baconians? Or does Leicester emerge from the historical facts as a man that fits the Bi-literal Cipher portrait of him as the father of Francis Bacon?

## SOME NOTES ON "BACONIANA," II.

ONE of the advantages of reprinting contributions from back numbers of BACONIANA, is that the opportunity can be taken to rekindle interest in aspects of the Bacon authorship mystery which have received scant notice in recent years. Last December we reproduced "Some Notes on Cervantes", by Mr. L. Biddulph, from the July 1941 issue, or No. 100 of the present Series. It seems appropriate, both literally and mathematically, to consider this time an article from No. 1 of this same Series, dated January 1903, dealing with Bacon's connection with *Sir Walter Raleigh* and "*The History of the World*." I have heard the opinion expressed that it is unwise to strain the credulity of readers by publicising the evidence or Bacon's influence on other Elizabethan writers, such as Raleigh, but it is surely wrong to suppress such data if the Society is to seek Truth. In any event, it would be surprising if a man of such restless intellect as Bacon had not influenced his contemporaries, and the idea that his was the master mind supervising and editing other men's work, and writing under assumed names, not only appears plausible, but is confirmed by internal evidence, similarities of style, phrase, and thought, etc.

NOEL FERMOR

### SIR WALTER RALEIGH AND "THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD"

*Based upon a Chapter in D'Israeli's "Curiosities of Literature"*

IN a chapter on "Literary Unions,"\* D'Israeli states his opinion that "a union of talents differing in their qualities, might carry some important works to a more extended perfection," and that many great works, commenced by a master-genius, have remained unfinished for want of this friendly succour. The secret history of many eminent works, he goes on to say (and we cannot doubt that he spoke with knowledge and authority), would show the advantages which may be derived from the combination of talents, differing in their nature. Having given a few examples of such co-operative works, D'Israeli launches out into a dissertation interesting to those who believe in the ubiquitous presence of Francis St. Alban in the great literature created or inspired by him. Thus writes D'Israeli:—

"There is a large work which is still celebrated, of which the composition has excited the astonishment even of the philosophic Hume, but whose secret history remains yet to be disclosed." (The writer does not, we observe, declare the secret to be *unknown*, but only *undisclosed to the general reading public*.) "This extraordinary volume," he continues, "is *The History of the World*, by *Rawleigh*.†

\**Curiosities of Literature*, V. 231.

†In a footnote, *ib.*, p.204, the varied manner in which Raleigh wrote his own name is commented upon. Rawleigh, Ralegh, and Rawly. The latter approaches nearly to the spelling usually accorded to the name of William Rawley, the chaplain and secretary of Francis St. Alban.



I shall transcribe Hume's observation, that the reader may observe the literary phenomenon. "They were struck with the extensive genius of the man, who being educated amidst naval and military enterprises, *had surpassed in the pursuits of literature, even those of the most recluse and sedentary lives*;"\* and they admired his unbroken magnanimity, which at his age, and under his circumstances, could engage him to undertake and execute so great a work as *his History of the World*.' "

"Now when the truth is known, the wonderful in this mystery will disappear, except in the eloquent, the grand, and the pathetic passages interspersed in that venerable volume. We may, indeed, pardon the astonishment of our calm philosopher, when we consider the recondite matter contained in this work, and recollect the little time which this adventurous spirit (whose life was passed in fabricating his own fortune, and in perpetual enterprise) could allow to such erudite pursuits. Where could Rawleigh obtain that acquaintance with the rabbins, of whose language he was probably entirely ignorant? His numerous publications, the effusions of a most active mind, though excellent in their kind, were evidently composed by one who was not abstracted in curious and remote inquiries, but full of the daily business and the wisdom of human life."

It cannot fail to strike the careful reader as remarkable that, when the well-read, clever Essayist proceeds to enumerate the probable or possible aids which Sir Walter may have obtained, and the literary characters with whom he lived in intimate friendship, Francis Bacon, indubitably the greatest philosopher, historian, and sage of his day, is not once mentioned, and this in the face of the facts that Sir Walter and Bacon were closely associated in more ways than one, that Francis visited Raleigh during his imprisonment, and, as before noted, that a kinsman of the latter was chaplain and secretary to the former.

During his imprisonment in the Tower "he joined the Earl of Northumberland, the patron of the philosophers of his age, and with whom Rawleigh pursued his classical studies; and Serjeant Hoskins, a poet and a wit, and the poetical 'father' of Ben Jonson, who acknowledged that *'It was Hoskins who polished him*;" and that Rawleigh often consulted Hoskins on his literary works, I learn from a MS." It is a pity that D'Israeli did not enable us to consult this Manuscript; but he honourably confesses that "however literary the atmosphere of the Tower proved to Rawleigh, no particle of Hebrew, and perhaps little of Grecian lore, floated from a chemist and a poet. The truth is, that the collection of the materials of this history was the labour of several persons, who have not all been discovered."

It is half comic and half pitiful to see how our writer beats about the bush, seemingly pointing slyly at the true author, wishing you to find him out, yet, for some cause, held back from telling what he knows. This is (as most of us know by this time) no isolated instance of the suppression of historical facts and episodes for the sake of hiding the chief actor. We have only to consider the rest of the personages in this performance to be sure who is the missing character.

\*The italics are D'Israeli's.

"It has been ascertained that Ben Jonson was a considerable contributor, and there was an English philosopher from whom Descartes, it is said, even by his own countrymen, borrowed largely." Now, at last we think, *it is coming*; "the English philosopher" from whom Descartes borrowed (or translated?)—so clearly indicated as the man behind the curtain of the dark—now at last he is to be proclaimed—Francis St. Alban!

Great is the fall. We learn that the philosopher to whom Descartes was so largely indebted, and whom Anthony Wood charges with infusing his philosophical notions into *History of the World*, is one Thomas Hariot, to whom, if indeed he was a great philosopher, the world has made but a shabby return. Probably not one ordinary reader out of a thousand ever heard of him, or dreamed that he had supplied Rawleigh with philosophical notions of any kind.

But Hume also has something to say on the subject, and D'Israeli quotes him. "If Rawleigh's *pursuits surpassed even those of the most recluse and sedentary lives*, as Hume observes, we must attribute this to a 'Dr. Robert Burrell, Rector of Northwold, in the county of Norfolk,' who was a great favourite of Sir Walter Rawleigh, and had been his chaplain. All, or the greatest part of the drudgery of Sir Walter's History, Criticisms, Chronology, and reading Greek and Hebrew authors, were performed by him for Sir Walter."

D'Israeli concludes comfortably that thus a simple fact, when discovered, clears up a whole mystery, and teaches us how, as Hume sagaciously detected, that knowledge was acquired "which needed a recluse and sedentary life, such as the studies and the habits of a country clergyman would have been in a learned age." Did Hume "sagaciously detect" the method by which a large portion of the sterling literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was composed and produced on co-operative principles, with one great centre and motive power, one director and organiser? Did he or any other serious investigator really believe that Francis St. Alban had nothing to do with the matter, but that Hariot was the inspiring philosopher of the mighty volume and *Ben Jonson, polished by Hoskins*, a considerable contributor? Ben, on our essayist's own showing, had not a high opinion of Sir Walter who, he told Drummond, "*esteemed more fame than conscience. The best wits in England were employed in making his history.*" After giving all this information, after saying that the whole mystery has been thus simply cleared up, D'Israeli confirms our suspicions of him as "a double-meaning prophecier," by saying in a foot-note that "the secret history of Rawleigh's great work had never been discovered."

It would be easy to prove from internal evidence how much of the *History of the World* is due to the pen of Francis St. Alban, but such collations and philological researches demand much space, and they would perhaps prove uninteresting to the majority of readers.

C.M.P.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS

*Prices  
(including British  
Postage)*

**R. L. EAGLE**

### **BACON OR SHAKSPERE**

**A GUIDE TO THE PROBLEM. . . . . 2/9**  
(Revised Title)

**EDWARD D. JOHNSON**

**WILL SHAKSPERE OF STRATFORD . . . . 3/9**

**FRANCIS BACON OF ST. ALBANS . . . . 3/9**

**MRS. B. POGSON**

**IN THE EAST MY PLEASURE LIES . . . . 9/4**  
(An interpretation of the Shakespeare plays)

**ROMEO AND JULIET . . . . . 2/10**  
An esoteric interpretation

**ALLS WELL THAT ENDS WELL . . . . . 2/10**  
An esoteric interpretation

**M. A. WITNEY**

**FRANCIS BACON . . . . . 2/6**

---

Please help the Society by buying these excellent publications,  
and passing them on to your friends.



## GIFTS FROM ORTHODOXY

By ARDEN

### PART IV. *Bartholomew Fair* (continued)

16. It had crossed my mind that the character **Cokes** had a name very similar to Sir Edward Coke, the lawyer rival and bitter enemy of Francis Bacon. In *Bartholomew Fair* Cokes and Overdo are related by marriage, for Cokes and Mistress Overdo are brother and sister. In Act 3, Scene 1, Cokes and Grace Wellborn (Overdo's ward) discuss the Justice in his absence, and mention is made of the well-known *A Caveat against cut-purses*.

The plot of the play just here seems to suggest that Jonson is inveighing against "cut-purses" on the bench. Cokes, in the scene, invites a cut-purse to take his money and flaunts his purse. Needless to say this is accomplished. The irony is heavily underlined if my theory that Cokes is a portrait of Edward Coke is correct, and as will appear later there is some justification for thinking so.

17. Act 3, Scene 1. A reference to Bacon's wit.

*Grace*: Nay, if you saw the justice her husband, my guardian,  
you were fitted for the mess, he is such a wise one in his way.

*Winwife*: I wonder we see him not here.

*Grace*: O! he is too serious for this place, and yet better sport then  
than the other three, I assure you, gentlemen, wherever he is,  
though it be on the bench.

This again seems to be strongly reminiscent of Jonson's opinion on Bacon's love of the jest in the midst of serious discussion.

18. The description of Justice Overdo on the bench at the beginning of Act IV, Scene 1, fits Bacon even more closely. Jonson is still at his admonitions, witness the following:

*Hag*: . . . justice Overdo is a very *parantory* person.

*Bri.*: O, are you advised of that! and a severe justicier, by your leave.

*Overdo*: (aside). *Do I hear ill o' that side too?*

*Bri.*: He will sit as upright on the bench, an you mark him, as a candle in the socket, and give light to the whole court in every business.

*Hag*: But he will burn blue, and swell like a boil, God bless us, an he be angry.

*Bri.*: Ay, and he will be angry too, when he lists, that's more; and when he is angry, *be it right or wrong*, he has the law on's side ever: I mark that too.

*Overdo*: I will be more tender hereafter. *I see compassion may become a justice, though it be a weakness, I confess, and nearer a vice than a virtue.*

There are here, at least four direct allusions to Bacon. We recall that Elizabeth called Bacon her "watch-candle" and Sir John Davies made a punning reference to his name in the anagram "Beacon of the State."

The "be it right or wrong" is a close echo of Jonson's other complaint against **Shakespeare** which he made to Drummond anent the play *Julius Cæsar*. Jonson's opinion on Bacon's speaking was that it was "censorious" and the first allusion in the above passage seems to echo that comment with the word "parantory" if its meaning can be taken that way.

That "compassion" may be a "weakness" is also an echo from the play *Measure for Measure* and from Bacon's own opinions on "swift justice."

19. Some confirmation that Cokes is Edward Coke the lawyer is to be found in Act 5, Scene 3. The scene is "Another part of the Fair" "The puppet-show Booth, as before."

As Cokes enters, he is followed by Overdo, who meeting him exclaims: "My fantastical *brother-in-law*, master Bartholomew Cokes".

This is an excellent jest and a pun for as both Bacon and Coke were lawyers—then they were "brothers-in-law"! But there are other reasons for making Cokes brother to Mistress Overdo as will be seen later.

20. Another Shakespeare allusion follows in the same scene where we find **Troubleall** continually demanding that everything and anything should be done by 'the warrant of Justice Overdo'. I have the suspicion that Troubleall is Shaksper for then the allusion to his love of the phrase "I warrant you" would be an echo from the plays which he was supposed to have written. The phrase occurs over 200 times and Jonson would surely note this for the purpose of admonition. But more to the Baconian point of view, Troubleall is a "mask" or "disguise"! For Quarlous-Jonson disguises himself as Troubleall and proceeds to deceive Overdo himself. There is a strong hint that Jonson wishes it to be known that he could carry the Shakespeare mantle, if only he had the "warrant".

21. I must confess that the next allusion came as a surprise but on reflection it is consistent with our avowed intent to search the play for Bacon's contemporaries. I had noted the Justice Overdo's wife is listed in the play's *dramatis personae* as "Dame Overdo", and as "Mrs. Overdo" when speaking. According to the orthodox theory, Mrs. Overdo's first name could very well have been **Anne** or **Agnes** since it is supposed that Jonson had the Stratford Man in mind. Instead, in Act, 3, scene 1, Dame Overdo's first name is revealed as **Alice**! Overdo himself makes the revelation:

"...when, sitting at the upper end of my table as I use, and drinking to my brother Cokes, (note the irony!) and *Mistress Alice Overdo*, as I will, my wife..."

Now Bacon's wife was **Alice** Barnham so once again we see that Jonson is pointing to Bacon. The whole scene should be read to get the full Baconian flavour.

22. As the scene continues there is one particular which stands out from the generalities, and this is contained in Overdo's soliloquy, which is of great length:

"I had thought once, *at one special blow he gave me, to have revealed myself*; but then (*I thank thee fortitude*) I remembered that a wise man . . . for no particular disaster ought to abandon a public good design."

In the play this refers to the beating given to Overdo by Waspe who is Cokes' man. I suggest that this is a reference to the "blow" given to Bacon by Edward Coke. We have Bacon's own comment on this in his correspondence, in a letter to Cecil. Bacon and Coke had an exchange of words during which Coke

" . . . threatened to *clap a capias utlegatum* upon my back."

In reply, Bacon tells Cecil that he told Coke " . . . he hunted upon an old scent." There are cryptic references to this matter in other Bacon writings.

23. A more pointed allusion to Coke the lawyer, is to be found in Act 5, scene 3.: **Zeal-of-the-Land Busy**, the Puritan, is engaged in argument with the puppet **Dionysius**. **Cokes** is an interested spectator and now and again interjects some comment into the argument. **Busy** charges the puppet with the sin of wearing the clothes of the opposite sex in his shows. Note the reply:

*Dion.*: You lie, you lie, you lie abominably.

*Cokes*: Good by my troth, *he has given him the lie thrice*.

The aptness of this interjection by **Cokes** is that, as a portraiture of Edward Coke by Jonson, the character is correct in showing approval of the threefold denial made by the puppet. It was during the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh that Coke, the Attorney-General, in a virulent speech used the following:

"All he did was by thy instigation, *thou viper, for I thou thee, thou traitor.*"

And strange to say, Shakespeare also echoes the same scene in his play, *Twelfth Night*, Act 3, scene 2.:

*Sir Toby*: . . . If thou *thous't him some thrice*, it shall not be amiss.

The orthodox commentators agree that this is an echo of Coke's speech against Raleigh and here we find Jonson using it to point to Coke.

24. The allusion to Alice Barnham gains greatly by another item in Act 3, scene 1. So far we are relying on the use of the name **Alice Overdo**, but we ought to expect that Jonson might point to Alice Barnham in a more personal way.

Remembering that in the play, **Cokes** is the *brother* of Alice Overdo, we find him inducing the puppeteer **Nightingale** to present his puppet show. Alice Overdo is present and the Justice is hiding in disguise.

*Night.*: . . . But 'twill cost a penny alone, if you buy it.

*Cokes*: No matter for the price; thou dost not know me, I see, I am an odd Bartholomew.



*Mist. Overdo:* Has it a fine picture, *brother*?

*Cokes:* O, sister, do you remember *the ballads over the nursery chimney at home o' my own pasting up*: there be brave picture, other manner of pictures than these, friend.

*Waspe:* . . . .

*Cokes:* . . .

*Night:* . . .

*Cokes:* We shall find that in the matter: pray thee begin.

*Night:* *To the tune of Paggington's pound*, sir,

*Cokes:* (sings): Fa, la la la, la la la, fa la la la! *Nay, I'll put thee in tune and all! mine own country dance!* Pray thee begin. (*My italics*).

Now we begin to see why Cokes is 'brother' to Alice Overdo. We are told that the ballad Paggington's pound is Cokes' ". . . own country dance", and since he asks Alice to remember the ballads pasted up "at home" then the ballad and tune must belong to Alice also.

And so it was! For the ballad "Paggington's Pound" is the *Pakington's Pond* ballad, which was written about a certain incident concerning Sir John Pakington who was step-father to the real Alice Barnham.

The details are to be found in the *Life of Alice Barnham* by A. Chambers Bunten, pages 10 and 11. We are told by Bunten that Sir John Pakington was well "Known throughout Worcester by his litigious nature." He had caused a pond to be made over the site of a farm and when the countryside rose in arms against him he broke the dam of the pond and tried to drown the countryside. Instead, the water drained harmlessly into the river Severn and the peasantry picked up the gasping fish. As Bunten says: "The County laughed and crowed at their success, and the story spread to London, and the Court there. The balladmongers of the day were not slow to make a broad sheet of the matter, which was wedded to a merry tune still to be found and danced to and called "Pakington's Pond" or 'Pakington's Pound'."

That Jonson means the same tune is shown by his own version, where we find the catch line "At Worcester 'tis well known . . ."

The ballad is a hit at the cut-purses on the bench, and the remarks made and interjected by Cokes are very ironical in the light that **Cokes**=Coke the lawyer. Jonson underlines the ironical intent in the following:

*Cokes:* Pray thee, stay a little, friend. Yet o' thy conscience Numps (*Waspe*, his man) speak, is there any harm in this?

*Waspe:* To tell you true, 'tis too good for you, less you had grace to follow it.

*Overdo* (aside): It doth discover enormity, I'll mark it more: I have not liked a paltry piece of poetry so well a good while. Apparently what was good for the goose was also good for the gander since it is obvious that Jonson was addressing both Edward Coke and Bacon, the two lawyers.

The punning use of the word "grace" is a play on Grace Wellborn, Justice Overdo's ward. There are puns on the name Grace in other

scenes. There is a hint at the rivalry between Coke and Bacon in the character Grace Wellborn, Overdo's ward; for Bacon presided over the Court of Wards during his lifetime. But as I have been unable to run this matter to earth I shall leave it for others to sort out.

25. The Alice Overdo-Barnham-Bacon allusion leads to a rather terribly confirmatory scene in *Bartholomew Fair*. Jonson has, in the play, introduced a character named "*Alice, Mistress o' the game.*" So in this play there are two characters named Alice! One is Alice Overdo, and the other is a prostitute. Assuming that Jonson knew what he was about, the inference seems to be that Alice Overdo represents a public personality, whilst the "*Mistress o' the game*" represents a public type. But it is clear that Jonson wanted to draw some parallel between the two characters, if the text is thoroughly examined. Jonson wanted to hint at some common identity and whilst there would be very little point in attaching to "*Alice, Mistress o' the game*" any attribute belonging to Alice Overdo, the reverse is certainly the intention of the scene in Act 4, scene 3. The prostitute has discovered Mistress Overdo in the booth of Ursula the pig-woman, and mistakes the purpose of her presence: Mistress Overdo is driven into view:

*Mrs. Overdo:* Help, help, in the King's name!

*Alice:* A mischief on you, *they are such as you are that undo us and take our trade from us, with your tuft-taffata haunches.*

*Knockem:* How now Alice?

*Alice:* *The poor common whores can have no traffic for the privy rich ones; your caps and hoods of velvet call away our customers, and lick the fat from us.*

*Ursula:* Peace, you foul ramping jade, you—

Here then is an open hint from Ben Jonson that Alice Overdo-Barnham was no better than a "privy rich whore." There are hints of the trouble Bacon had with his wife in several works but it will do to recall two such items. In his will Bacon revoked "... for great and just causes" the estates and valuables which, in the earlier draft, he had assigned to his wife. Within a few weeks of his death in 1626, Alice Barnham married Bacon's Gentleman Usher, Sir John Underhill.

The rest of the scene shows that both Alice Overdo and Mistress Littlewit are present for the purpose of procurement and Jonson puts protest in the mouth of Alice Overdo-Bacon.

It must be made clear that this allusion is well hidden from an audience, for the name of Mrs. Overdo is only mentioned twice in passing. The second occasion is in the very last speech of the play. I doubt whether the identification can be made by only watching the play. But the procurement scene is bad enough if Bacon was expected to recognise himself as Overdo and his wife in Mistress Overdo.

*Bartholomew Fair*, as Dobbes suggests more than once, seems to be an answer to the *Return from Parnassus* play where we are told Shakespeare gave Jonson a "purge". In *Bartholomew Fair* the import is that Jonson gave Shakespeare a "beating".

26. The following scene confirms many times that Overdo is

Bacon; Act 4, scene 3.: Quarlous, Cutting, and the rest are at their "vapour" (fighting), and Mistress Overdo protests:

*Mrs. Overdo:* . . I'll commit you upon my woman-hood, for a riot, upon my justice-hood, if you persist. (*Exeunt Quarlous and Cutting.*)

*Waspe:* Upon my justice-hood! mary so-o' your hood: you'll commit! spoke like a true justice of peace's wife indeed, and a *fine female lawyer!* . . (my italics)

*Mrs. Overdo:* Why Numps, in master Overdo's name, I charge you.

*Waspe:* Good Mistress Underdo, hold your tongue.

*Mrs. Overdo:* Alas, poor Numps!

*Waspe:* Alas! and why *alas* from you, I beseech you! or why *poor* Numps, *goody Rich!* Am I come to be pitied by your tuft-taffata now? Why, mistress, I knew Adam the clerk, your husband, when he was Adam Scrivener, and *writ for two-pence a sheet*, as high as he bears his head now, or you your hood, dame,— (my italics).

The general tenor of this scene is very biting and there can be no doubt that Jonson held Alice Overdo-Bacon in great contempt. Look at the play on the name Underhill! I should not have been tempted to see more than a coincidence in the twist to the names Overdo, and Underdo, had it not been for the further reminder to Overdo-Bacon that he had asked for the hand of Lady Rich in marriage before he married Alice Barnham. And Waspe in the last speech brings in the reminder by calling Alice Overdo-Bacon "goody Rich" where the spelling is as Jonson wrote it with the capital letter.

Note also that Waspe in his frenzy of contempt, which is hardly justified by the situation at all, refers to Overdo as "Adam the clerk", and "Adam Scrivener". This is a sneer at Bacon's early poverty, and again fastens down Bacon's connection with the scrivenry. There seem to be many private allusions in this scene, for they bear the stamp of highly individual characterisations for which there is no artistic purpose connected with the plot.

27. My last allusion seems to confirm the tradition that Shaksper the Actor received £1,000. The exact amount need not be taken literally, nor mean anything more than a symbolic patronage. The scene is in Act 5, scene 2, where Quarlous-Jonson is disguised as Troubleall, Overdo's man. Overdo is resolved to reward Troubleall for his pains and meeting the disguised Quarlous he demands to know what favour he can give.

Assuming Quarlous is Jonson and Overdo is Bacon, the scene is very suggestive:

*Quarl.:* Your hand and seal will do me a great deal of good; nothing else in the whole Fair that I know.

(Overdo then goes out to a nearby "scrivenry" to set out a blank warrant, and whilst he is away Quarlous continues:)

*Quarl.:* Why, *this madman's shape* will prove a very fortunate one, I think. *Can a ragged robe produce these effects?* If this be



the wise justice, and he brings me his hand, I shall go near to make some use on't.

*Re-enter Overdo.*

He is come already!

*Overdo:* Look thee! here is my hand and seal, Adam Overdo; if there be anything to be written above in that paper that thou wants't now, or at any time hereafter, think on't, it is my deed. I deliver it so; can your friend write? (the "friend" is *Dame Purecraft* who represents, I think, Jonson's art.)

*Quarl.*: Her hand for witness, and all is well.

*Overdo:* With all my heart. (*He urges her to sign it.*)

*Quarl.*: Why should not I have the conscience to make this a bond of a thousand pound now, or what I would else? (*Aside.*)

The "else" is to be found in Overdo's speech a few lines further back when he first intercepts Quarlous in the disguise of Troubleall:

"... Do you want a house, or meat, or drink, or clothes? speak whatsoever it is, it shall be supplied you; what want you?"

All this seems to suggest plainly that Jonson knew of the gift to Shaksper, and he says "Can a ragged robe produce these effects?" as much as to say "How is it that this weed must be worn when the disguise is slight?" Therefore he is putting forward his own writing ability as a much better disguise behind which to hide the true author of the Shakespeare Plays. Note that Overdo specifically mentions "a house" amongst his suggested gifts to Troubleall, who represents Shaksper of Stratford.

The general sense seems to hint at a *rapprochement* between Jonson and Bacon-Shakespeare. As Quarlous-Jonson says in his final admonition to Overdo-Bacon:

"... Nay, sir, stand not you fixed here, like a stake in Finsbury, to be shot at, or the whipping-post in the Fair, but get your wife out o' the air, it will make her worse else; and remember you are but *Adam flesh and blood!* you gave your frailty, forget your other name of *Overdo* and invite us all to supper. There you and I will compare our discoveries; and drown the memory of all enormity in your biggest bowl at home."

We know that Jonson was engaged in writing his *Discoveries* long before the date of this play, and in it he paid handsome tribute to Francis Bacon. But in the above passage it becomes clear that he has named his character Adam Overdo with contrasting names each carrying an aspect of Bacon-Shakespeare. He is saying 'come down to earth and do not be so superior'. And the warning about Alice Overdo is a threat that he, Jonson, has further arrows in his quiver.

If it is thought I have seen too much hidden in *Bartholomew Fair*, I must end with Jonson's own words from the Epilogue:

*You know the scope of writers, and what store  
Of leave is given them, if they take not more,  
And turn it into licence: you can tell  
If we have us'd that leave you gave so well:*

THE END

# FRANCIS BACON'S UNACKNOWLEDGED DEBT TO THE SCHOOLMEN

By ANTHONY MARY COLLINS

## PART IV

TO sensible and revealed knowledge in connection with theology the Schoolmen added infused knowledge by which the understanding can "penetrate further still so as to know what it cannot know by its natural light" since "the natural light of our understanding is of finite power." (*Summa Theologica*, Part II, Second Part, Question 8, Art. 1):

"Understanding implies an intimate knowledge . . . This is clear to anyone who considers the difference between intellect and sense because sensitive knowledge is concerned with external sensible qualities whereas intellectual knowledge penetrates into the very Essence of a thing."

Also in the *Summa*, Part I, Q. 12, Art. 13, St. Thomas says

"The intellect's natural light is strengthened by the infusion of gratuitous light."

Bacon says the source of some portion of our knowledge such as that of "the substance of the rational soul" is divine inspiration (*De Augmentis*, Book IV, Chapter 3), but Professor Fowler considers that by this he means biblical, rather than personal inspiration. Fowler however goes on to point out that in the *De Augmentis* "he does undoubtedly refer our moral sentiments to a sort of divine influence acting immediately", which Professor Fowler says seems to constitute a third source of knowledge. This would seem to follow on the teaching of the Schools. In *De Augmentis*, Book IX, Bacon says

"The use of human reason in a matter relating to religion is of two parts, the one in the explication and conception of the mystery: the other in Illations and inferences derived from thence. As touching the explications of mysteries we see that God vouchsafed to descend to the weakness of our capacity so expressing and unfolding His mysteries as they may be best comprehended by us, and inoculating as it were his Revelations, upon the conceptions and notions of our Reason, and so applying his inspirations to open our understanding, as the form of the key is fitted to the lock . . ." (Wats' original translation).

That Bacon held (to revert to the definition of Scholastic Philosophy) that there was a natural distinction between good and evil and that our duty to do good and avoid evil is absolute, is amply demonstrated in all his writings and especially in his *Confession of Faith* where he says Good and Evil have their own principles and beginnings. He holds (as did the Schoolmen through revelation) the doctrine of the Fall, and though he does not go into their subsequent persuasive proof, he even agrees with them (*Summa Theologica*, Part I

Q. 2, Art. 3. Reply to Objection 1) that to bring good out of evil is one of the intellectual confirmations of the existence of God, when he says in the *Advancement of Learning*

"The wisdom of God (is) more admirable when nature intendeth one thing and Providence draweth forth another."

So subconsciously steeped is he in the old teaching that one almost expects to hear him echo "*O felix culpa!*"

He does not anywhere express as does St. Thomas (*Summa Theologica*, 1st Part of Part II, Questions 18-24) the logical deduction of the existence of good and evil. He accepts it all axiomatically. One would like flippantly to say that perhaps experimentally he arrived at it by induction! He does however insert in his generalisations both in the *Essays* and his scientific works, odd remarks such as "Moral virtues are in the mind of man by habit and not by nature" (*Advancement of Learning*). This is a direct tribute paid whether knowingly or not, to the Thomists since there is an affirmative in the *Summa Theologica*, 1st part of Part II, Question 63, Art. 2) to the question "Whether any virtue is caused in us by habitation." Here however Bacon may have derived his notion direct from Aristotle's *Ethics*, Book VI. since he makes no comment, as he does in other places (indicating usually with the proverbial 'faint praise') that "the Schoolmen" have also made such a pronouncement. As for the existence of good and evil and our duty respectively to seek the one and avoid the other as first principles, Bacon would independently of his avowed logic of induction and his unsuspected logic of deduction, have drawn from the Bible as the source of the 'moral sentiments' referred to by Professor Fowler and quoted earlier. Bacon says so in *The Advancement of Learning*, xx, 7, and in the opening phrases of that paragraph asserts that the Nature of Good is twofold, first as everything is total or substantive in itself, and secondly as it is a part or member of a greater body, the latter being indisputably the higher. He conforms to the teaching of St. Thomas in the *Summa*, Part II (1st Part), Question 18 and especially Article 6.

Taking the second sub-division made by Bacon in his treatment of the Philosophy of Man, namely the Civil Aspect, St. Thomas in Part II (1st part) Question 104, Art. 4, of the same *Summa*, says:

"Now in every people a fourfold order is to be found. First of the people's sovereign to his subjects; a second of the subjects among themselves; a third of the citizens to foreigners; a fourth of members of the same household . . . and according to these four orders we may distinguish different kinds of judicial precepts in the Old Law."

Bacon, the great lawyer, found no place to digress on law in his *Great Instauration*. He divided Civil Relationships into the Art of Conversation, the Art of Negotiation, and the Art of State Policy", with a few odd remarks—in every sense of the expression—about 'Prudence' and the "Art of Rising in Life"! Yet Lord Bacon must in his official capacity have been influenced, if unconsciously, by this Friar called the



"Dumb Ox who later filled all Europe with his bellowings", whose magnificent Treatise on Law in the *Summa Theologica* has, to quote the Very Revd. Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., S.T.M.

"begotten a school of thinkers. Modern historians of International Law are frankly realising that from this Thomist School of thinkers sprang the Science of Law, national and international."

The writer in *Frontiers of Faith and Reason* goes on to say

"When the Carnegie Institute of Washington undertook to republish the leading Classics of International Law it is not without significance that their first published Classic was '*De Indis relectio prior*' of the Spanish Dominican Francis de Victoria (1480-1546)."

The first lawyer of England, and a man of Lord Bacon's erudition was not likely to be ignorant of these Treatises, and it is felt he could hardly dispute their truth.

In the final application of law to Government the *Summa Theologica*, Part II (1st Part) Q. 105, Art. 1, recommends the Constitution:

"in which there is an apt mixture of monarchy, in so far as there is one supreme ruler; of aristocracy, insofar as many share in power according to their deserts; and of democracy or popular rule, in so far as the rulers can be chosen from the people and are chosen by the people."

Lord Bacon supported such a Constitution.

Coming to the Second Division which Bacon made in Science or Learning generally, namely Theology as distinct from Philosophy, for the Schoolmen the chief source of Revelation affecting their philosophy (as distinct from the relatively unimportant dogmas of their religion), was the Sacred Scriptures. The Thomists, particularly, reinforced almost every argument with authoritative quotations therefrom, and the last book of the *Summa Theologica* consists solely of a list of Biblical and Patristic references the latter taking up only a page or two. Of the former there are on an average seven or eight for each chapter and a total of about 4,000. Bacon also scattered texts throughout his works and undoubtedly had a deep reverence for the Bible as a source of revelation, and inspiration in its more colloquial sense. On the interpretation of Scripture he is of one mind with the Schoolmen. St. Thomas in the *Summa Theologica*, Part I Q. 1, Art 10, makes two divisions in Scriptural Interpretation, namely Historical or Literal, and Spiritual, the latter being divided into Allegorical, Moral and Anagogical. In the *Advancement of Learning* Bacon says:

"... the Scriptures which being written are not to be interpreted only according to the latitude of the proper sense of the place, and respectively towards that present occasion whereupon the words were uttered, or in precise congruity or contexture with the words before or after, or in contemplation of the principal scope of the place, but have in themselves, not only totally or collectively, but distributively in clauses and words, infinite

springs and streams of doctrine to water the Church in every part. And . . . as the literal sense is, as it were, the main stream or river: so the moral sense chiefly and sometimes the allegorical or typical as they whereof the Church hath most use."

It appears that he meant by the 'Church' the Church of England since it is not disputed that he was an orthodox English Protestant: yet strangely enough his lengthy and detailed *Confession of Faith* with only one exception (relating to the dogma of Purgatory) could have been written by a Roman Catholic. Whereas in generalities this is the less surprising, it is noteworthy that he exceeds the most daring Protestant in acclaiming the Blessed Virgin "Mother of God", granting her the title bestowed on her in 431 A.D. at the Council of Ephesus as a safeguard of the teaching of the Divinity of her Son. One senses the influence, not of the Catholic Church as a teaching body, but of the logic of the Schoolmen which followed on the logic of the Council of Ephesus—a concession which Bacon made in this instance to deductive logic!

It is noteworthy too, that whereas normally the Protestant religion asserts that the Christ "was raised" from the dead or ambiguously that "He rose again", Bacon follows the accurate wording of the Schoolmen in his *Confession*, saying that "He raised Himself." This phraseology may be by chance, but a lawyer does not usually make personal declarations without weighing his words. He followed the logic over the "*Mater Dei*": he probably did over the Resurrection.

In this other branch of Science, namely Revealed Theology, Bacon is not so far away from the Schoolmen as is usually thought. He describes himself in the First Preface to the *De Augmentis* as "vanquished with an immortal love of Truth." It was an adequate expression significant of a mind brilliant enough to take in "all knowledge for his province", but unable through a fixed idea to delineate with perfect justice the scintillating outline of every facet of that Truth. He failed gloriously in his ambition, but he fired, or 'moved' as Macaulay said, 'the intellects which moved the world'. Had these latter kept somewhat closer to those doctrines of philosophy which Bacon derived, probably unconsciously, from the Schoolmen, the world might have been a little less unhappy in its movement later in the centuries, and science have been divorced only from metaphysics and not from morals.

In fundamentals such as existence of matter and form, cause and effect, sensible and rational knowledge, personality, spiritual existence and values, and code of behaviour, "that great Secretary of Nature and of all Learning" (as Isaac Walton called Bacon) followed the Schoolmen: yet he said he had no use for their deductive logic. In this he was most illogical. With due deference, it is submitted that he was somewhat at fault. Without his assuming the First Principles of the Thomists (which although largely Aristotelian had been re-introduced and sponsored by them to the exclusion of Scepticism, Platonism and many other Philosophies) the structure of the philosophy of Francis Bacon would surely fall.

In his theology he had to accept either personal revelation (which

it seems he never claimed), revelation to a teaching body, and/or the Sacred Scriptures. He does not state his authority guaranteeing either of these last. It is difficult to see any other than the authority of the Authority of the Schoolmen.

#### THE END

As the final proofs for BACONIANA are going to the printers, the biennial international conference of Shakespearian scholars is being held at Stratford-on-Avon.

Of immediate interest to our readers is that a speaker is reported to have expressed the opinion that the *New English Dictionary*, although of considerable use in putting "Shakespeare's use of words in the right perspective," was not "comprehensive, absolutely reliable, or definitive" as to their meaning "in any particular poetical context; furthermore, there was a need to disentangle those he selected, and those he invented. For example, Jaggard's *Treasury of Ancient and Modern Times* (1613) quotes *abra, cadabra*, which the *Dictionary* dates from 1696. The remarks surely help to round off the discussion which has been appearing in our pages recently, and which we mention editorially this time, on the subject of the use in the Biliteral Cypher of words which may not, at first sight, appear to be traceable to the Elizabethan era.

N.F.



## OBITUARY

### Dr. R. Langdon-Down

We very much regret to announce the death of Dr. Langdon-Down in London recently. Readers of this magazine will remember his learned contribution, *Observations on Shelton's Don Quixote*, which appeared in the July 1952 issue (No. 143), and this has served to stimulate interest in the whole question of the circumstances surrounding the authorship and translation of this classic work. The last has yet to be heard on the subject, and we might well reiterate Dr. Langdon-Down's queries: "Whose is this pen? Whose is this thought?"

Our Society can ill afford the loss of a respected member.

N.F.

\* \* \* \* \*

In T. B. Shaw's *Outlines of English Literature* (1848) one reads:

"In Bacon's mode of writing there is that remarkable quality which gives the style of Shakespeare such a strongly marked individuality; that is a combination of the intellectual and imaginative, the closest reasoning, the boldest metaphor."

Such a statement as this coming from a distinguished man-of-letters is only one of several similar opinions expressed in the first half of the 19th century before perception, or honesty and fearlessness of expression, became either blinded or petrified through fear of weakening the Stratford position by dropping ammunition into the Baconian stronghold.

[Thomas Budge Shaw, 1813-62, M.A. Trinity, Cambridge]

R.L.E.

EDITOR'S NOTE. Readers who wish to study the similarity of "that remarkable quality" common to Bacon and "Shakespeare" writings, are strongly advised to ponder the numerous examples given by the late Dr. Melsome in his excellent and learned book, *Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy*.

# QUEEN ELIZABETH AND BACON'S BIRTHDAY

By R. L. EAGLE

**I**N the Index to the Records known as *The Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, Vol. XIV, p. 170, occurs an entry under the date 22nd January, 1560 Westminster, as follows:

"The Queen to Archbishop Parker and other Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes: Directs certain Lessons in The Book of Common Prayer to be altered, and others substituted in their place. Latin copies of The Book of Common Prayer to be used in the Collegiate Churches with additional clauses to be inserted as to setting Tables of the Commandments in Chancels, &c."

As there is no disputing the fact that Francis Bacon was born on 22nd January 1560 (old style), a visit to The Public Record Office to inspect the document indexed was well worth while, for this important business of the Queen on that day is significant in view of the biliteral cipher story, published by Mrs. Gallup, as to Bacon having been the son of the Queen.

Can anybody seriously maintain that she would have arranged to attend to the matter, or could have done so, at the very time she was expecting a confinement (according to the cipher story)? Her mandate for the several alterations in the Prayer Book could have waited.

Now it is quite common for a first confinement to follow some twenty hours or more of intermittent pains, and no woman, not even the strongest, can have anything else on her mind at such a time. Elizabeth was not even a healthy woman as medical and documentary records prove (see Chamberlin's *The Private Character of Queen Elizabeth*, The Bodley Head, 1922).

Are we expected to believe that she was attending to State affairs as usual at Westminster while in the pains and anxieties of labour (during which the royal physicians and others would be in attendance), and then proceed to York House for the actual birth? What a day in the life of a Queen! And, marvellous to relate, nobody reported anything unusual; not even the very observant Cecil who was regularly in conference with her!!

Inspection of the original document at the Public Record Office shows that it is on one side of a sheet quarto size, and about one quarter of the following sheet. It bears the familiar flourishing and ornamental signature of Elizabeth at the head. It is in a *firm hand*, followed a little lower, and to the right, with "By the Queene." The last sentence says that it is "Given under our signet at our Palace of Westminster the xxij Day of January the third yeare of our reign 1560."

There is reference to this matter in John Strype's *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (1711). He says:

"Now for the amendment of these Disorders and Inconveniences, the Archbishop procured Letters under the Queen's Great Seal dated 22nd January to the Commissioners for their greater authority."

Archbishop Parker had been busily engaged since his appointment in December 1558 on the revisions, so that The Book of Common Prayer should be brought into conformity with the Protestant faith.

In view of the indisputable facts now put before the readers of *BACONIANA*, would it not be an act of charity to dismiss Mrs. Gallup's "decipherment" as among the curiosities of literature?

#### EDITORIAL NOTE:

Mr. E. D. Johnson, a lawyer, has commented as follows on the legal aspect of the above article.

Mr. Eagle mentions Queen Elizabeth *giving audience* to the Archbishop and others. He gives no evidence to show that the Queen gave audience to anyone. The fact that the entry is dated 22nd January 1560 does not prove this. Even to-day the fact that a deed bears a certain date is no evidence at all that it was executed by the parties on that date. I do not think that it happens once in a hundred that a Conveyance or other document bears the date on which it was executed. There is a penalty if a deed is not stamped within thirty days of its execution. It may be that the deed is executed a long time before but it is dated back to save paying a penalty, or it may be that the Vendor has a mortgage on the property which has not been discharged at the date of completion, so the deed has to bear a date subsequent to the date of the discharge of this mortgage, although it may have been executed a long time before.

Mr. Eagle dissents from Mr. Johnson in the following reply:

Mr. Johnson argues that legal documents (Conveyances &c.) are not necessarily signed as dated. I quite agree that the only important date is that mentioned in the body of the document or deed. But this Mandate contains no date other than that which appears at the foot, and no comparison is reasonable between documents of the nature with which solicitors are familiar, and a State Paper such as the one under discussion. This is entered in Parker's *Registrum* bearing the same date. It was printed in *The Correspondence of Matthew Parker* (No. XCIV) edited by J. Bruce and Rev. T. T. Perowne (Cambridge, 1853). See also *Registrum Matthei Parker* (Vol. I) published by The Canterbury and York Society, London 1928.

Readers will no doubt draw their own conclusions from this controversy, although Mr. Johnson, writing as a lawyer, seems confident of his case.



## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Dear Sir,

Re Mr. Sayle's letter in the May number, page 44, it may be of interest to add that "the Ape of Nature" is pictured in Robert Fludd's book *Microcosmi Historia Tomi Secundi Tractatus primi sectio secunda*; the engraving represents homo or Man, standing in a circle of the Arts, with an ape in the centre, and was printed in 1619.

In another book of Robert Fludd "*Tomus Primus Utriusque Cosmi Historia*" etc., printed in 1618, there is a very beautiful folding plate in which, at the centre, there is a very similar design, but in this case the central emblem, an ape, is surmounted by a nude woman whose right wrist is chained to an emblem representing the Deity, whilst her left hand holds another chain to which the ape is attached. The female figure represents Nature; the Ape, Homo or Man.

Referring to *Don Quixote*, it may be remembered that Anthony Bacon was in Spain about this period, on Secret Service mission and it would seem probable that he acted as agent for Francis Bacon in his literary work there. Shelton, the reputed translator of *Don Quixote* into English, appears to have been a mysterious, if not shadowy, figure, as apparently nothing is known of him, according to the editor of a reprint of his *Don Quixote* published in two volumes about twenty-five years ago.

A question was asked in a recent number of BACONIANA as to whether Mrs. Gallup's decipherments had ever been checked or verified. This was done by the late Mr. Henry Seymour in a copy of Francis Bacon's *History of Henry VII*, 1622 edition. I understand that Mr. Seymour was able to do this without reference to Mrs. Gallup's decipherment and obtained identical results. After Mr. Seymour's death, this copy of *Henry VII* marked a, b, etc., passed into the hands of Mr. Valentine Smith, but what happened to it after Mr. Smith's death I cannot say as his widow destroyed all his private papers including records of the Bacon Society and disposed of his books, whether by sale or mass destruction I am not in a position to state. However, I can testify to having seen the decoding marked in Mr. Seymour's copy of *Henry VII* before his death.

Yours faithfully,  
L. BIDDULPH

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Dear Sir,

MR. IVOR BROWN

In 1950 Mr. Ivor Brown published a book entitled *Shakespeare*. This book contained a number of statements quite unsupported by any evidence so on 1st December last I sent the following letter to Mr. Brown:—

Dear Mr. Brown,

In a note at the bottom of page 29 of your book *Shakespeare* you say "There were several variant spellings of Shakespeare. I have kept to the most familiar one for convenience sake". It is not at all convenient for your readers that you should spell Shakespeare in the *only way* that was *never used* by Shakspeare or his family. By doing this—the reader does not know if you are referring to Shakspeare the man or Shakespeare the author. On page 12 you say "in his own time Shakespeare was liked and esteemed." There is no evidence that Shakspeare the man was liked and esteemed so I assume that you refer to the plays. You then refer to Francis Meres and Richard Barnfield but these gentlemen are alluding to the fame of Shakespeare the author and not to the man.

All references to Shakspeare, direct and indirect, in contemporaneous literature during the period 1592-1616 have been carefully collated. They number 127 classified as follows—those made to *his works* 120; those made to him as a man 7.

Your book gives your readers the impression that Shakspeare was known in his time as a dramatist. This is not true. How do you account for the fact that none of the noted men of letters in his day ever mentioned Will Shakspeare? Do you suggest that there was a conspiracy to ignore the man who was the greatest of them all?

On page 25 you say "This book of mine will solve nobody's problem, if certainties are sought". This of course provides you with the opportunity of producing some very wishful thinking without being called upon to account for any statements which may not be true and are quite unsupported by any evidence.

On page 30 you say "The Ardens of the Senior Succession were lordly people and their big house was at Park Hall near Birmingham. Though Mary Arden's *branch of the family* were junior there is *ample proof* that all of her branch were on easy terms with the *nobility and gentry* of the Midlands." I know of no proof in support of this statement. When the Shaksperes applied for a coat of arms, they tried to prove that Mary Arden was related to the great Arden family at Park Hall but were turned down because they could not do so.

On page 37 you refer to a scene in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* but you do not explain that this scene does not appear in the Quarto of this Play printed in Shakspeare's lifetime but is an *entirely new scene* inserted for the first time in the Folio of 1623 printed seven years after Shakspeare's death.

On page 40 you refer to Sir John Mennes and say "The roseate hues and blithe good temper of Shakespeare Senior *may well be authentic.*" I can only assume that you are not aware that Sir John Mennes was *two years old* when Shakspeare's father died. A Shakespearean authority Dr. Furnivall jumped at this like a trout at a fly and in the *Westminster Gazette* (31st Oct. 1904) wrote, "This is the only known notice of the look of Shakespeare's father and is a great gain." A great gain to whom? If a great gain to the Stratfordian cause it means that the infant Mennes must have been taken from his cradle in Kent where he was born, to Stratford, in his nurse's arms, for the purpose of interviewing Shakspeare's father of which interview he made a mental note which he put into writing when he had learned to write. This is almost as idiotic as the suggestion of the late Lord Norwich that Will the comedian who went abroad with a company of actors was Will Shakspeare and not Will Kempe.

On page 47 you say "It is not impossible that Shakespeare went to a university." It is quite impossible because if so the moment Shakspeare became popular as a dramatist any University that he had attended would at once have claimed him as one of its sons. He would also have no time for this—if as the Stratfordians say he spent some time in a lawyer's office and was also a schoolmaster. All these occupations must have been before he was married at eighteen years of age.

On page 50 you say that Anne was the eldest child of Richard Hathaway. Hathaway's eldest child's name was Agnes and not Anne. Sir Sidney Lee said that Agnes and Anne were the same name. The late Sir Charles Isaac Elton, G.C., has proved that Agnes and Anne were entirely different names.

On page 60 you say "It was partly due to William's excellence in the quality *he* professed" as Henry Chettle phrased it in 1592 and on page 72 you refer to Henry Chettle's tribute to *one unnamed but generally taken to be Shakespeare*. It has been proved that Chettle was not referring to Shakespeare—it was Sir Sidney Lee who slipped in the word Shakespeare in brackets after the word *he*, so this false statement does not give you the right to say that "it is plain that by the end of 1592, Shakespeare was an up and coming dramatist, etc. . ."

With regard to the Earl of Southampton on page 68 you say "He was rapidly successful and *admitted to the high, gay company of Lord Southampton's*

circle." On page 73, you say "The young man was already climbing socially. The great friendship with the Earl of Southampton had begun."

On page 107, you say, "The social stage, to whose fringe or prompt corner Shakespeare was led by Lord Southampton."

On page 157 you say, "He found time to write *Venus and Adonis* and was in touch with Southampton and his circle." On page 166, you say "Whether there was still a deep attachment between the patron and the poet we cannot tell but there was certainly close acquaintance and theatrical association. On page 179, you say "Henry Wriothesley, the young Earl of Southampton, was in 1593—an indisputable record where so much is disputable—the poet's patron."

On page 299, you say "Shakespeare according to known facts and contemporary allusions was certainly under patronage to the Earl of Southampton and seemingly a close friend of that nobleman."

On page 300 you say "Shakespeare after some years on the fringe of Southampton's society (and possibly after some foreign travel in the Earl's Company)."

On page 303, you say "The brilliant young arrival in the theatres, Southampton's pet of genius."

Everyone of these references to Shakespeare's acquaintance with the Earl of Southampton is pure surmise and I challenge you to produce a single scrap of evidence to show that Southampton had ever even heard of Will Shakespeare of Stratford, much less being his patron.

All you can produce is that two poems *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* were dedicated by one "William Shakespeare" to the Earl.

The satirists John Marston and Joseph Hall tell us quite clearly that the author of these two poems was a lawyer nicknamed LABEO who hid himself like a cuttle fish and that LABEO's motto was "*Mediocria Firma*" which was the Bacon family's motto.

On page 335 you say, "He preached the virtues of an ordered monarchy but presented a cavalcade of English Royalty that is not much better than a rogues' gallery."

"In the midst thou shalt go safest." Quite so and this was Bacon's motto, "*Mediocria Firma*."

Mrs. C. C. Stopes, who was a most industrious searcher after new light on Shakespeare's life wrote *The Life of Henry Wriothesley 3rd Earl of Southampton*. In the preface she said "I must confess that I did not start this work for its own sake, but in the hope that I might find out more about Shakespeare, which hope has not been satisfied."

Mrs. Stopes evidently hoped to find evidence that Southampton and Shakespeare were intimate friends and that Southampton was Shakespeare's patron, but apparently she could not, nor any evidence to show that the supposed friendship ever existed. I feel very strongly that anyone writing a book on a subject such as "Shakespeare" should be careful to give the reader all the known facts; not just those that suit the theory he holds but all the facts whether favourable or otherwise, and let the reader use his own judgment.

I notice you make no comment on the extraordinary fact that when Will Shakespeare died—no one took the slightest notice of this important fact, and not a solitary soul expressed the slightest regret that he had passed away. Surely the answer is that no literary person was interested in the death of the retired actor and tradesman of Stratford who never at any time claimed to have written anything or to have had any connection whatever with the writing of stage plays.

Mr. Brown acknowledged receipt of my letter but said that he was very busy with broadcasting. I have written to him several times without any result.

Well over three months have passed since I first wrote to Mr. Brown, but I am still without any replies to the questions raised in my letter.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON



To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

Your correspondent, Mr. Breach, begins his letter to you by asking if any one has gone to the trouble of checking the work of Mrs. Gallup, or whether it has all been taken for granted, and ends by sturdily proclaiming his belief in its authenticity.

Might one ask Mr. Breach what means of verification or system of reasoning brought about this happy conversion from total ignorance to implicit conviction? One has an uneasy suspicion that his study of Mrs. Gallup's work has been—if one may venture to coin a phrase to suit the context—more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Yours faithfully,

ALAN SMITH

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

Trophonius in his letter in the current issue of BACONIANA says that the biographers give York House in the Strand as Francis Bacon's birthplace. I do not know which biographers he is referring to, but I should have thought that the most reliable biographer would be Dr. William Rawley, who was Francis Bacon's personal friend and secretary.

Dr. Rawley in his 'Life' says, "Francis Bacon, the Glory of his Age and Nation, the Adorner and Ornament of Learning, was borne in *York House or York Place* in the Strand, on the two-and twentieth day of January in the year of Our Lord, 1560" (i.e., 1561). The question arises what did Dr. Rawley mean to infer when he wrote that Francis Bacon was born in *York House or York Place*? Dr. Rawley should have known exactly where Bacon was born; why therefore give an alternative? The reason for this will be discovered when we realise that York House was the home of Sir Nicholas Bacon and York Place was the Palace of Queen Elizabeth. Dr. Rawley is evidently giving his readers a straight hint that Francis Bacon's birth was shrouded in mystery.

Trophonius asks: how did the Queen manage to give an audition to Archbishop Parker at the Palace the same day that Francis Bacon was born?

I challenge Trophonius to give any evidence that the Queen gave this audition to Archbishop Parker.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON

**Editor's Note:** See Queen Elizabeth and Bacon's Birthday, page 88.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

### THE PORTRAIT OF THE BARD

Dear Sir,

I have often been asked what evidence there is that the picture of Will Shaksper in the First Folio is not really a picture of any man but a dummy mask. In spite of Ben Jonson imploring the Reader not "to look on his Picture but his Book" let the Reader spend a little time over "the only authentic picture of the Bard in existence". No human being could wear the coat shown, one half being the front of a coat and the other half the back.

The head is the same length as the body so he must have been a dwarf. The staring eyes are both right eyes—not one right and one left. Sir William Russell Brain of Harley Street discovered this. In any human face—the angle made by the lids of an eye where they meet nearest the nose is less acute than the angle at the outer end and the *inner* half of the upper lid is narrower than the *outer* half. What should be the *left* eye is really another *right* eye. Cover up the right eye, nose and mouth and the reader will see the importance of Sir Russell Brain's discovery.

Now turn the picture upside down and let the Reader ask himself the following question. "If this is a picture of a human being, why are the phallic symbols so clearly shown by the nose and mouth? Then let him refer to the play of *All's Well that Ends Well*, Act 2, scene 3, and the 11th and 12th lines from the stage

direction "Reënter Lafeu" and he will not be in a position to deny that the Picture of "Will Shaksper" is only a dummy mask.

This is the greatest hoax ever known to mankind.

No one with eyes to see could possibly imagine that the monstrosity pictured in the First Folio is a picture of any human being—and yet idolatry has reached such a pitch that one deluded Stratfordian wrote "Here indeed we find the features which characterize the Author of *Romeo* as well as of him who wrote *Julius Caesar*. What nobility in that forehead! With what feeling is rendered the pensive and penetrating expression of the eyes and of the smile, of which the irony is softened by the sweetness of soul!"

Any comment on the above would be superfluous.

Faithfully yours,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

I was amazed to find in your issue of December 1954 a jest of which I believe myself to be the inventor: that Bacon could be proved to be the author of *Don Quixote* by translating Sidi Hamete Benengeli into Sir Little-Ham, the Son of the Englishman. I have been teasing Baconians with this jest for these thirty years. But, to quote a Spanish saying: *Si es broma puede pasar*. In earnest, it won't "pass" at all. It is too slender to justify the endeavours of your correspondent to belittle everything Cervantes wrote save *Don Quixote*. Contrary to what he says, had Cervantes never written *Don Quixote*, he would still count as a first rank figure in Spanish literature.

Yours sincerely,

SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA

**Editor's Note:** We are glad to have this good-humoured rejoinder from so eminent a figure in Spanish letters as Senor de Madariaga. We must console ourselves with the words of Mr. Parker Woodward on this question, in a previous BACONIANA: "When a man declares that he is not the real author of a work but its FOSTER FATHER, and that its real author was one 'Sidi Hamete Benegeli', he raises doubts and invites enquiry."

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

In your May 1955 issue in the last letter Mr. Bridgewater queries a previous correspondent's statement, "now that it can be accepted that Francis Bacon died at Stuttgart, Dec. 18th, 1647." This heartens me in my feeling that Bacon had something to do with Henry More's "Philosophical Poems," of which I have a copy of the second edition, printed at Cambridge University in 1647. Is there any information connecting More with the Bacon circle? I find no reference to Plotinus in Bacon's writings, but feel that More's poems reflect what would be Bacon's reaction to Neo-Platonism during his latter years.

After some years of this kind of thinking I looked for some clue in cypher or typographical signature, and to my amazement found what I consider an unmistakeable signature of Bacon in the first stanza of Canto I of "Psychozoia,"—page 1 of the poems. The initials N is upside down, which could be a notice to the reader. In the first three lines are found in capitals F BAKON, reading backwards to the initial letter.

When Manly P. Hall was shown this he said he doubted that Bacon ever used k instead of c in a signature, but Walter C. Arensberg cites instances in "Cryptography of Shakespeare," p. 109.

Perhaps if Mr. Bridgewater is presented with a signature in a book printed in 1647, he will be less inclined to be astonished and dismayed at the Count de Randwyck's letter stating that Bacon may have lived until December of that year!

Your effort in helping to solve this will be appreciated.

Cordially,

JOHN C. FARLEY

## ADDENDUM

In recent correspondence in the *Daily Telegraph*, complaint was made that the hotel service in Stratford-on-Avon was unsatisfactory, particularly as regards meeting the special needs of visitors during the Festival season. In this connection, our member, Mr. T. Wright, sent the following letter, which was acknowledged but not published:—

The Editor, *Daily Telegraph*

Dear Sir,

When, recently, I told a friend that I intended to pay a first visit to Stratford-on-Avon, he, to my great surprise, suggested that I should not go, if I wished to retain any respect for the memory of William Shakespeare. He spoke of the "mummery and mockery" of the 'birthplace' with its museums of 'relics' and of the mercenary character of the town which these had brought about.

If my friend's opinion is correct, and the Stratfordians' belief in the authenticity of such vital things is waning, then we can expect to find a corresponding lack of enthusiasm in the 'running' of the town, including the hotels.

Yours faithfully,

T. WRIGHT







This emblem appears eight times in the first folio edition of Bacon's works (*Opera Omnia*. Frankfort o/M 1665). Although the eagle was a recognised symbol of Zeus, "Jupiter sitting upon an eagle"—exactly as described in *Cymbeline*, Act v, scene iv—seems to be depicted here for the first time in literature. (See letter from Dr. Gerstenberg)